



3 1761 06891370 6



DISSERTATIONS

UPON AN

HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS.

13.6.1.1
Q

DISSERTATIONS

UPON

THE PRINCIPLES

AND

ARRANGEMENT

OF AN

HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS.

BY

EDWARD GRESWELL, B. D.

FELLOW OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD.

SECOND EDITION,

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

OXFORD,

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

MDCCCXXXVII.



THE CONTENTS

OF

THE THIRD VOLUME.

DISSERTATION XXXIV.

On the notices of time supplied by Luke xii I—25

ANACHRONISM involved in the place sometimes assigned to this chapter—Ill consequences of it—Virtue of Christian watchfulness I—3

Particulars of this chapter belong to the same point of time—Divisions of it, which supply notices of time—Address of our Lord to the disciples—Perceptible difference between the language now employed, and on a former occasion—Apostrophe to our Lord's future sufferings—*Βάπτισμα* and *βαπτίζεσθαι*—Baptism *ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν*—Vicarious baptism—The war and the fire, which our Lord came to cause upon earth—The hour of our Lord—Paraphrase of his words generally—Comparison with his language in St. John. 3—11

Address of our Lord to the multitude—Reference to the demand of a sign—Reasoning of our Lord in refusal of that demand—Difference between his language now, and in St. Matthew—Time or season of the Messiah in general—Last time or season of the Messiah in particular 11—12

Illustrations employed by our Lord—Season of rain and fair weather in Judæa—*First* rain and *latter* rain—Harvest in Judæa—*Δνομένης Πλειάδος*, as used by Josephus of the vernal rains—Date of the *Πλειάδων* *δύσις*—Similar language of Æschylus—Time of the year of the capture of Troy—Annual inundations of the Jordan—Duration of the dry season—Inauguration of Saul—Dearth in the time of Elijah—Menander, the Tyrian historian—Rizpah, daughter of Aiah—Recurrence of the autumnal rains—*Ἡ νεφέλη*, or *the* cloud 13—18

South winds in Judæa, hot and parching—Winds through the year, north and south—The south wind, a fair wind—*Λευκόνωτος*—The south wind, Etesian—South winds, the winter winds—Lucretius' description of the seasons—South winds, blowing in the spring quarter—Ornithiæ or Chelidoniæ—Capture of Masada—Caravans from Egypt to India, and back—South winds in Egypt, in April and May—Murmuring of the Israelites at Taberah—Scene on the Lake of Galilee—Heats in harvest, in Judæa 18—23

General conclusion from the above premises—The present, the last or concluding season of the Messiah's ministry on earth . . 23—24

Confirmed by the address to the people—Nature of the reasoning employed—Power of the creditor over the person of the debtor—Application of the supposed state of the case, to our Lord and the Jews of the time 24—25

DISSERTATION XXXV.

On the incident relating to the Galileans, Luke xiii. 1—9. . . . 26—37

Idiom of St. Luke, *ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ* 26

Galileans in question, whether followers of Judas of Galilee, or natives of Galilee—Name of Galileans, as descriptive of a sect—Herodians—Judas of Galilee, a native of Gamala, Golan, or Gaulan—Name of his party, Zealots or Sicarii—Zadok the Pharisee—Party of Judas, suppressed or dispersed at its first appearance—Descendants of Judas, at intermediate periods, afterwards—Manahem, U. C. 819—Principles of the Galileans, incompatible with the ascendancy of the Roman government—Jesus in Galilee at this time—Galileans the subjects of the recent occurrence, a *part* of the people of Galilee. 26—30

Fate of these Galileans, a recent event—Language of our Lord in reference to the eighteen—Site of Siloam or Siloah—Fate of these Galileans, not brought on themselves—Scene of the event, the temple, and presence of Pilate at Jerusalem, an argument that it happened at some feast—Cæsarea—Guard in Antonia—Case of Barabbas, an argument of a recent sedition in Jerusalem—Bloodshed on that occasion, the bloodshed of Roman soldiers. . 30—32

Presence of Herod at Jerusalem, at the last Passover—Quarrel of

THE CONTENTS.

vii

Herod and Pilate—Reconciliation effected, by the sending of our Lord to Herod—Argument thence derivable of the cause of the misunderstanding previously.....	32—34
Circuit of our Lord, now drawing to a close—Resort of the Jews to Jerusalem, <i>before</i> the feasts—General conclusion from all these premises—Confirmation of this view, by the account of what passed at our Lord's examination—Silence of Josephus no objection—Paucity of particulars of the administration of Pilate—Tranquillity of the previous part of our Lord's public ministry—Sedition of Barabbas at its end, permissive	34—37

DISSERTATION XXXVI.

<i>On the question concerning divorce</i> , Matt. xix. 3—12. Mark x. 2—12	38—44
Omission of this account by St. Luke—Omissions in St. Matthew, supplied by St. Mark—Resulting conclusion of the final end of St. Mark's account—Reconciliation of the accounts on this principle, together	3839
Question, as stated in St. Mark, presupposes St. Matthew's—Reference of our Lord to the decision of Moses—Not inconsistent with his deciding the same question himself—Rule of our Lord, in replying to questions from the law—Liberty of divorce, as conceded by the law—Revival of the original law of marriage upon Christians—Question of the Pharisees, not prompted by a proper motive—Previous decisions of our Lord on the subject of divorce—Abuse of the license of divorce by the rabbis, among the people of the time, as well as of polygamy—Final decision of our Lord on the subject	39—43
Harmony of the narratives in conjunction	43—44

DISSERTATION XXXVII.

<i>On the miracles performed at Jericho</i>	45—50
Difference in the three accounts of these miracles—St. Luke's miracle performed <i>before</i> the arrival at Jericho, St. Mark's <i>after</i> —On no supposition to be made to appear the same.	45
Ancient mode of reconciling these difficulties, the true—Two mi-	

acles performed, and at distinct times : the second related by St. Mark, the first by St. Luke, and both by St. Matthew 46

Reasons, why St. Matthew should join both these accounts—Does not affirm his order of them—*Kaì ἰδοὺ*, not a note of time... 46—47

Reasons, why St. Mark should relate one of these miracles, and St. Luke the other—Time of St. Matthew's *double* miracle, the same in part with that of the *single* miracle in St. Mark—Case of Bartimæus, probably peculiar—Miracle of St. Luke supplies the omission in St. Mark, and rectifies the order in St. Matthew—Two *single* miracles of these two evangelists, equivalent to the one *double* miracle of the third—*A priori* probability of a double miracle—Circumstances of the double miracle in St. Matthew, alike applicable to the single in either instance. 47—50

DISSERTATION XXXVIII.

On the time of the arrival at Bethany—and on the day of the procession to the temple..... 51—88

Controverted questions, in the last division of the Gospel history—Time of the arrival at Bethany. 51—52

No date of the arrival, in the first three accounts—Supplement of the defect by the fourth—Idiomatic sense of *πρὸ* or *μετὰ*, in notices of time—Not a classical Greek idiom—Founded on the similar Latin idiom—Examples or illustrations of both, Greek and Latin—General conclusion from these premises—Day of the arrival of our Saviour at Bethany, the *sixth* day *exclusive*, or the *seventh* day *inclusive*, of the day of τὸ πάσχα—Τὸ πάσχα necessarily inclusive of the day of the Passover—Day of the arrival at Bethany, the eighth of Nisan—The eighth of Nisan, March 30, and both a Saturday 52—59

Arrival of our Saviour, not necessarily *on* the sabbath—Course of our Saviour, from the morning of the passage through Jericho, to the time of stopping with Zacchæus—Jesus in Peræa, on the morning in question—Jordan crossed at Bethabara—Distance of Jericho from Jerusalem—Rate of an ordinary day's journey—Aulon of Jordan, and breadth, on both sides of the river—Site of Abila on the verge of the Aulon—Distance of Abila from Bethany—House of Zacchæus, between Jerusalem and Jericho—Final end of

our Lord, to stop with him for the night—Use of *καταλύσαι, ἀπλῶς*—Pitching time of travellers, in the East—*Παρασκευῇ* on the Friday—Supper-time of the Romans and Jews—General conclusion, that our Lord stopped with Zacchæus on the evening of Friday the seventh of Nisan, within three or four miles of Bethany 59—64

Arrival at Bethany on Saturday, after the close of the Sabbath.—The Sabbath, probably kept at this time as a fast—Testimonies to that effect—Customs or traditions of later times, not implicitly true of the times of our Saviour—Supper on the first day of the week, different from usual—Accords with the supper given to our Lord at Bethany—Time of the evening's repast among the Romans—Time among the Jews, later than sunset—Supper-time in the East, generally—Usage of the Greeks, to sup after sunset—Followers of our Lord might travel to their own homes on Friday, though he himself stopped with Zacchæus—General conclusion from the above premises—Passion-week of our Lord strictly a week, from Saturday to Saturday 64—69

Course of events, from the arrival at Bethany to the day of the procession—Limits of a sabbath day's journey—Resort of the Jews to Bethany, on Sunday in Passion-week—Lazarus at Bethany, along with Jesus—Day of the procession to the temple, Monday in Passion week—Improperly referred to Palm Sunday—Confirmed by the testimony reflexively, of the other evangelists—Tenth of Nisan, or Monday in Passion-week, the only fit day for our Lord's first appearance in public on this occasion—Necessary to the details of subsequent events in Passion-week, to date them from this day—Connection of these events, and the days on which they were to happen—Possible reference of the three days now passed in public, to the three years of the previous ministry 70—75

Accounts of the procession to the temple—Bethphage, why specified before Bethany—High road to Jericho over Olivet—Meeting of our Saviour, by the Jews from Jerusalem—Boughs, why carried on this occasion—Meaning of the act of strewing clothes in the way—Mission of Peter and John for the ass's colt—Reconciliation of the several accounts—The colt alone used by our Lord—Ephippia or garments of the disciples, on which he rode—Presence of the dam along with the colt—Hosannas or acclamations of our Lord's attendants—*Καράβασις* of mount Olivet—Remon-

strance of the Pharisees—Acclamations of the multitude, and various accounts of each—Weeping of Jesus over the city—Procession through the city—Arrival at the temple, and proceedings there—Departure of our Lord for the night—Question of the Hellenes or Greeks—Not Jews of the dispersion, but Gentile proselytes—General conclusion of the time of the arrival at the temple 75—86

Inference thence deducible of the final end of the procession itself—Lamb for the Passover, taken up on the tenth of Nisan—Pascha Ægyptium, and supposed peculiarity of circumstances belonging to it—Our Lord, the daily sacrifice as well as the Paschal victim—Lambs for the daily sacrifice, taken up four days before they were offered 86—88

DISSERTATION XXXIX.

On the proceedings of Tuesday in Passion-week, and on the time of the cleansing of the Temple 89—108

Cursing of the barren fig-tree—Reason of the omission by St. Luke—Πρωτ and Πρωτα—Time of morning's meal among the Jews—Morning service in the temple 89—90

Circumstances of the account—Double crop of the fig—Ficus biferæ, or prodromi—Early ripe figs—Fruits of trees offered with the δράγμα—Physical history of the early ripe fig, from Hilary and Ambrose—The modern Boccere—Permanency of fruits in Judæa—Egyptian fig or mulberry—Plain of Themiscyra on the Pontus 91—94

Reconciliation of the accounts of the effect of the miracle on the tree—Remark of the apostles, and our Lord's reply to it—The effect on the tree visible at the moment, complete some time after—St. Mark's account prepares the way for a renewed allusion to the subject, the next morning. 94—97

Cleansing of the temple, whether now performed—Cleansing of the temple, according to St. Matthew, either twice performed, or related out of its place the day before—Incident of the children in the temple—Probability of the latter alternative, rather than the former—Circumstances of the cleansing in St. Matthew, similar to those in St. Mark—Arrival at the temple the evening before,

too late in the day, for any cleansing to have then taken place—Cleansing of the day preceding must have failed of its effect, if repeated the next morning—Teaching of our Lord after the cleansing, incompatible with the supposition of a cleansing the day before—Offence of the Jewish rulers at this teaching, produced by the cleansing—Idiomatic peculiarity of St. Luke's account of these proceedings—Question, By what authority doest thou these things? of the following day, due to the act of cleansing, the day before—Cleansing of the temple on this occasion, at the close of our Saviour's ministry, analogous to the same act at the outset of it—Once performed on each occasion, for a similar reason—Probable reasons of the anticipation in this instance, in St. Matthew 98—108

DISSERTATION XL.

On the proceedings of Wednesday in Passion-week, and on the time of the unction at Bethany 109—132

Peculiarity of this day in the history of our Saviour's ministry, and remarkable character of the events upon it 109

Renewal of the conversation in reference to the fig-tree—Difference between what was now said by our Saviour, and what was said before 109—111

Divisions of the rest of the day—Events in the temple—Questions successively proposed to our Lord by the three principal sects, and their objects, individually and collectively—Probably the result of concert 111—112

Question of the sanhedrim, By what authority doest thou these things?—Members, or constituent parts of the sanhedrim—Time of the interrogation—Parable or illustration of the father and two sons—Parable of the vineyard—Parable of the wedding garment—Omissions in St. Mark and St. Luke 112—114

Question of the Herodians—Involved the principles of Judas of Galilee—Name omitted, characters or persons, described by St. Luke—Language of their address in St. Mark 114—115

Question of the Sadducees—Proposed a real case—Admits a resurrection to come, in order to reduce it *ad absurdum*—False first

- principle, on which it is founded—Object and effect of our Saviour's answer—Final end of marriage—Limit of the increase of the human species, finite—Harmony of the various accounts—Observation of the Scribe, on the reply of our Saviour—Question, concerning the greatest commandment—Why omitted by St. Luke, and recorded by St. Mark—The motive of this inquirer, good—*Πειράζων*, not tempting, but making trial—Time taken up by these events 115—119
- Question of our Lord, Whose son the Christ should be?—Number of the Pharisees—Harmony of the accounts—Proper divinity and proper humanity of Jesus Christ, both involved in this question 119—121
- Reproof of our Lord of the Scribes, recorded by St. Mark and St. Luke—Reasons for considering this both distinct from, and prior to, the longer invective in St. Matthew—Scribes and Pharisees not necessarily the same—Court of the women; and the treasury or Corban, there—Women's court, why the place of our Lord's resort in the temple 121—123
- Time and place of John xii. 37 to end—Considerations which fix it to the last day of our Lord's public ministry, and the last discourse on that day 123—125
- Time of Matthew xxiii—Close of our Lord's public ministry, and end of proceedings within the temple 125—126
- Events without the temple—Prophecy on mount Olivet—Remark of St. Luke on the mode of our Lord's employment hitherto, at its close 126—127
- Unction at Bethany—Altogether different from the unction in St. Luke—Unction in St. John, the same with that in St. Matthew and St. Mark—Unction in St. John, recorded in its proper place; yet the unction in St. Matthew and St. Mark, not properly recorded out of it—Distinction between a transposition, and an historical recapitulation—Connection of the account of the unction with the treachery of Judas—History of this treachery, divisible into three stages—First conception of the design, due to what passed at the unction on the Saturday—Compact with the sanhedrim, concluded on the Wednesday—No objection, that Judas must have harboured

his design from that time to this—Language of the evangelists in allusion to the treachery of Judas, in harmony with the above conclusions 127—132

DISSERTATION XLI.

On the time of the celebration of the last Supper ... 133—172

Difficulty of the present question, and to what cause due—*A priori* improbability in a case like this, that the testimony of one of the Gospel accounts should be irreconcilably at variance with that of another 133—134

The last supper of our Lord, a passover in some sense or other : yet the Jewish passover, at the time of its celebration, still to come—Distinction of τὸ πάσχα, and τὰ ἄζυμα—Neither used ἀπλῶς, without including the other—Usage of St. John in this respect—Usage of Josephus—Usage of Philo Judæus—Ἡ διάβασις, or τὰ διαβατήρια—Usage of Ezechiel Tragicus 134—138

Proposed solutions of the difficulty—Objections to the opinion, which maintains that our Saviour's passover and the Jewish were one and the same—Sense of τὸ πάσχα, according to this opinion—Name of Passover, applied to the peace offerings of the fourteenth of Nisan—Φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα never used, except of the actual paschal sacrifice 138—140

Παρασκευὴ absolutely, προσάββατον—Ἐπέφωσκε, in St. Luke—Παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, not simply προσάββατον—Sabbaths of the passover properly what—Limits of the προσάββατον, or παρασκευὴ ἀπλῶς—Limits of the παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα—Προσάββατον, a general, προσάββατον τοῦ πάσχα, a specific designation, which cannot be interchangeable—No part of the fifteenth of Nisan could be devoted to the preparation for the sabbath—The parasceue, or preparation, part of a *dies profestus* 140—142

Alternatives, between which we have still to choose—More probable that our Lord anticipated the regular passover, than that the regular passover was celebrated on a wrong day—Reasons for coming to this conclusion 142—143

Argument first—Passover of our Lord, whatever it was, celebrated on Thursday—Message of our Lord, preparatory to its celebration,

sent to one who was probably a disciple—Resort of strangers to Jerusalem at the passover—Opening of the houses of the inhabitants to their reception—Paschal companies or *sodalitia*—Our Lord's message nothing extraordinary, on the supposition of the regular passover—His *time*, necessarily his hour, or passion—Masters of families empowered to act as priests, in behalf of themselves and their families, in the sacrifice of the passover—Testimonies to this effect of Philo Judæus—Not at variance with the accounts of Josephus, or with cases in point in the Old Testament—The first passover, so sacrificed by each master of a family for himself—Multitude of victims at the passover, and time within which they were sacrificed—Computation of Josephus, below the truth—Difficulty solved by these conclusions 144—149

Argument second—Precaution of the sanhedrim, not to apprehend our Lord during the feast—Not likely to be changed by the overture of Judas—*Ἀπερ ὄχλου*, means what—Our Lord actually arrested, tried, and executed, in time to anticipate the feast—Circumstances of the account, between the time of Judas' going out, and our Lord's apprehension, inconsistent with the celebration of the passover, as then and there going on. 149—152

Argument third—Attempt of Pilate to liberate our Saviour, in deference to the privilege of the feast—Meaning of the phrase, *κατὰ ἐορτήν*—Probable date of the privilege—Feast arrived, when the people insisted on the privilege, but not past—Observance of this privilege by Pilate on former occasions—Conclusion thence deducible, that he had been more than one year in office at the time of the Passion—Coming in of Simon of Cyrene, on the morning of the crucifixion—Had for its object the celebration of the passover that day—Distance from Jerusalem, on the morning of the passover, at which the passover might still be kept. . 152—154

Argument fourth—The passover, *two* days distant, at the close of the prophecy on the mount; that is, on the evening of Wednesday in Passion week—Passover, coupled with the delivering up of our Lord at the same time—This delivering up, the work of the Friday 154—155

Argument fifth—Apprehension of our Lord, his trial and execution, on the fifteenth of Nisan, inconsistent with the strictness of the observance of the sabbath at this time—Testimonies to that strict-

ness—Observance of the sabbath among the Gentiles—Opera servilia, proscribed on the sabbath—Extraordinary sabbaths, as sacred as ordinary—Sanctity of the sabbath, not purposely waived in the case of our Saviour—Crucifixion of the thieves along with him, an argument that there was nothing special in his case—Sanctity of the sabbath extended to the *παρασκευή*, from the ninth hour of the day before—Bodies of our Saviour and of the thieves, taken down with the commencement of the *παρασκευή*, and *against* the sabbath, as it was 155—160

Argument sixth—The sabbath which followed the crucifixion an High day ; because an ordinary and an extraordinary sabbath coincided upon it : that is, it was the fifteenth of Nisan, and the seventh day of the week—No high day, the effect of the coincidence of the sabbath upon *any* day of a feast, but the fifteenth or twenty-first of Nisan, or the fifteenth or twenty-second of Tisri 160—161

Argument seventh—Fulfilment of the legal equity, in the death of our Lord—System of types necessarily connected with the truth of the typical character of the passover—Passover fixed to one day in the year, Nisan 14—Passover fixed to one place in Judæa, Jerusalem—Circumstances of the passover, all conspire to point out our Saviour as the true paschal victim—Ninth hour, or article of his expiration—Meaning of the phrase, *between the evenings*—Death of our Saviour answered also to the daily sacrifice of the fourteenth of Nisan—Ordinary time of morning and evening service—Beginning of evening, among the Jews—Morning service might not be over before the fourth hour of the day—Time of evening service on the paschal day—Coincidence of the miraculous darkness with the temple service going on at that moment—Resurrection of our Saviour, and the wave sheaf offered at the passover—Time of this presentation, critically the time when our Saviour rose from the dead—Ancient punctuation of St. Mark's words, *ἀναστὰς δὲ πρῶτ'*—Essential to all these correspondencies, that Christ should have died on the fourteenth of Nisan . . . 161—168

Judgment of the primitive church on the above questions—Unanimous, in one and the same conclusion—Testimony of St. John, from the necessity of the case, not contradictory to, but explanatory of, that of the other Evangelists—Language of these last not sufficiently explicit, and why—The *last* passover, the first eucharist

or sacrament—This eucharist proleptical, and therefore probably the passover. 168—170

Day of a Jewish feast, reckoned to be arrived when its proper evening was come—The paschal feast an octave: and therefore the evening of Thursday part of the feast of unleavened bread, as well as the morning of Friday—Our Lord's passover celebrated at the beginning of the same *νυχθήμερον*, of which the Jewish was celebrated at the end—Passover always eaten on the evening of the fifteenth—Construction put by the Greek interpreters on the *πρώτη* of St. Matthew or St. Mark 170—172

DISSERTATION¹ XLII.

On the proceedings of the night of Thursday, and the morning of Friday, in Passion-week. 173—256

Distribution of the events of both these periods—Harmony of the accounts—All difficulties removed by the hypothesis of supplementary Gospels 173—174

Events of the first division—Beginning of our Saviour's paschal supper—Paschal ritual of the time—Introduction of the first cup, according to St. Luke—Washing the feet of the disciples, in St. John—Institution of the first part of the Christian sacrament, the breaking of the bread—Absence of the article, in the allusion to the bread—Proper sense of *ἄpros*—Institution of the cup, at a time distinct from that of the bread—Antedated by St. Luke, postponed by St. Matthew and St. Mark; and for what reason in either case—Final end of the evangelical accounts of the proceedings at the last supper in general, twofold—Treachery of Judas, and its connection with these proceedings—Sacramental institution, not a proper transposition in either account. 174—183

Point of time of the introduction of John xiii. 18—20—Coincidence of all the accounts at this point—Conversation between Peter and John, and our Lord, relative to the recognition of Judas—Roman custom of reclining upon couches at meat—Place of the master of a table—Propriety of the language of St. John—Entering of Satan into Judas—Point of time of the departure of Judas 183—186

First prediction of the denials of Peter—Dispute among the disciples

which should be greatest—Menial or servile character of the duty of washing the feet—Proper sense of *ἐξαιτίσθαι*—Second prediction of the denials of Peter—Institution of the second part of the Christian sacrament, the blessing of the cup—The Hillel, or Psalms of thanksgiving—Protracted conversation of our Lord and the disciples in the upper chamber, still 187—191

Departure of our Lord and the disciples from the upper chamber—Time of the night when it took place—Gethsemane—Gardens in the suburbs of Jerusalem—Distance of Olivet from Jerusalem—Third prediction of the denials of Peter—First promise of the manifestation of our Lord in Galilee 191—194

Agony in the garden—Tacitly recognised by St. John—Proper sense of *καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε*, in St. Matthew and St. Mark—Supplementary character of this part of St. Luke's accounts—Distinction of what passed between our Lord, and the eight apostles at the entrance of the garden, and the three within the garden—*Δίθου βολή*, inapplicable to the description of a *little way off*—Sleep of the disciples—Duration of the agony—Critical interposition of the arrival of Judas. 194—198

Arrangement of subsequent events—Attempted resistance of Peter—Address of our Lord to Judas—Omission of the name of Peter in the former accounts—The young man in St. Mark. . 198—200

Events of the second division—House of the high priest in Jerusalem—Site of the temple—Annas, the vicar of Caiaphas—First of our Lord's examinations, the examination before Caiaphas in St. John—Second examination of our Lord, the examination before the sanhedrim in St. Matthew and St. Mark—Interval between the two—Usage of our Lord, at the end of it—Third examination of our Lord, the examination before the sanhedrim in St. Luke—Particular proofs of the distinctness of this last from all before it—Council chamber of the sanhedrim—Motive to the second examination by the sanhedrim, the preexisting difficulty of the want of testimony against our Lord—Informality of the time of the former examinations—The *forms* of the Jewish law purposely observed in the proceedings against Jesus—Number of the witnesses suborned against him—Cleansing of the temple in St. John, and allusion to it in this fact in St. Matthew and St. Mark 200—206

Denials of Peter, and times of each—Harmony of the accounts in detail—Female doorkeepers among the Jews—St. John known to be a disciple of Jesus—First denial—Second and third denials—Turning of our Lord, and looking upon Peter—Ἐπιβαλὼν—Place of the denials in the examinations of Jesus—Times, ascertained by the crowing of the cock—Language of our Lord, in reference to the denials, as before the crowing of the cock—Cock-crow ἀπλῶς, a well defined point of the night—Coincident with the fourth night watch—Designated also as περὶ ὄρθρον—Cock-crows, distinct from this, twofold—Testimonies to, and illustrations of, all these statements—Divisions of the night, inclusive of cock-crow as well as the rest—Censorinus, Macrobius, Varro, Marcus Aurelius—Further illustrations of the time described by cock-crow—Cock-crow, in the primitive church—Cock-crow, the time of the resurrection of our Lord—Place of the gallicinium in these divisions—Cock-crow at the equinox, four in the morning—Moretum of Virgil—Resulting times of the denials of Peter, and of the first and second examinations of Jesus 207—217

Events of the third division—Repentance and death of Judas—Abduction of Jesus to Pilate had for its object the execution of the sentence already passed—Probable motives to the repentance of Judas—Time and place of what passed between him and the council—Purchase of the potter's field, with the thirty pieces of silver—Aceldama of St. Matthew, different from the Aceldama of St. Peter in the Acts—Suicide of Judas—Proper sense of ἀπάγξασθαι—Field purchased by Judas, before his death—Prophecy of Zechariah, when fulfilled—Sites of these Aceldamas distinct 217—220

Proceedings before Pilate—Point of time, in the course of these proceedings, when Jesus was not yet examined by Pilate *pro tribunali*, and after which he was—St. John's accounts confined to the former, those of the other three to the latter—Inductive proof of this conclusion, in the detail of proceedings in St. John 221—225

Forensic phrases, βῆμα, and καθίσαι ἐπὶ βήματος: *tribunal*, and *sedere*, or *considerare pro tribunali*—Tribunals of the magistrates of Rome, placed on paved floors—Pavimenta and Lithostrota—Lithostrotum in St. John, distinct from the Lithostrotum in the temple, alluded to by Josephus. 225—228

Point of time, when Pilate was now assuming the tribunal—Sixth

- hour in St. John, and various reading of the third instead—Supposed autograph of St. John's Gospel, in the time of the Paschal Chronicon—Our Lord crucified at the third hour, not tried—Hours of St. John agreeable to the modern, not the ancient computation—A trial before Pilate at six in the morning, no objection—Early habits of the ancients—Illustrated by cases in point. 228—230
- Detail of these proceedings in the first three evangelists, had begun at this point of time—Phrase, *σπῆναι ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνος*—Message of the wife of Pilate—Motion of Cæcina, U.C. 774—Arrangement of the several accounts—Good confession of our Lord—First attempt of Pilate to liberate Jesus, *pro tribunali*—Mission of Jesus to Herod—Motives to it, and reconciliation of Pilate and Herod—Place of the conclusion of the account of the proceedings before Pilate, in St. John—Second attempt to liberate Jesus, *pro tribunali*—Third and fourth attempts to liberate Jesus, *pro tribunali*—Delivery up of Jesus to the will of the people—Scourging of Jesus, preliminary to his being executed—Jesus led away to be crucified 231—237
- Reasons, which might have produced the omission in the first three evangelists, of the particulars in the above account supplied by St. John—Uses of this supplement in St. John, to fill up or explain the preceding accounts. 237—240
- Events of the fourth division—*Ἀγσται*, or malefactors, led away with Jesus—Number of the soldiers—Simon of Cyrene—Criminals condemned to be crucified, carried their own crosses—Cross of our Lord divided with Simon—Calvary or Golgotha—Tradition, respecting the burial place of Adam—Calvary, the common Tyburn of Jerusalem—Christ's suffering without the gate—Vinegar and gall—Posca of the Roman soldiery—Shape of the cross, and form of suspension upon it—Position of the three crosses—Title attached to the cross of Jesus—The penitent and the impenitent thief—Titles attached to crosses in general—Parting of the garments of Jesus—Third hour of the day 240—248
- Particulars from the third hour to the sixth and ninth—Commendation of the Virgin by our Lord to St. John—Miraculous darkness—Particulars from the ninth hour to the expiration of Jesus—Moment of our Lord's death, of his own appointing—Crucifixion

not a speedy death—Examples of that fact—Particulars from the expiration of Jesus, to the time of his interment—Probable anticipation in St. Matthew of the account of the resurrection of many that slept, at the expiration of Jesus—Bodies of the crucified, not usually taken down from the cross—Blood and water from the side of Jesus—Petition of Joseph of Arimathæa—Grave-clothes and spices, at the burial of the dead 248—254

Events of the Saturday in Passion-week—Application of the sanhedrim to Pilate, to set a guard over the sepulchre of Jesus—Guard set after the expiration of the sabbath, or on the evening of Saturday 255—256

DISSERTATION XLIII.

On the Harmony of the accounts of the Resurrection. 257—320

Period comprehended by the accounts in question—Difficulties connected with them, confined to the day of the resurrection. . . . 257

Distribution of the events of this day—Consideration of the visits to the tomb, prior to that of the appearances of the angels—Number of visits on record. 257—258

Visit in St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. John, *prima facie* the same—Visit in St. Luke, *prima facie* not the same—Considerations which render it probable beforehand, that the visits to the sepulchre on the morning of Easter day would be distinct—Motive ascribed to the visits of the women to the tomb, in each of the accounts—Imperfect performance of our Lord's funeral rites, on the evening of Friday—Embalming among the Jews—Disembowelling, whether a part of it or not—Design of a visit to the tomb, on the morning after the sabbath, implicitly recognised in the account of what passed at the burial—Preparation of spices by some of the women, on the evening of Saturday—Providential effect of our Lord's being buried on the Friday—Setting of the guard, unknown to the disciples at the time. 258—263

Harmony of the accounts upon the morning of Easter day, based on the principle of a twofold visit of the women—Probable reasons, *a priori*, why these parties of women should be distinct—Parties as such, recognised in the Gospel accounts, party of Salome, and party of Johanna—Proofs of the distinctness of these parties. 263—266

Reasons, *a posteriori*, that the parties in question actually were distinct—Comparison of particulars of the visit in St. Matthew, with those of the visit in St. Luke—Comparison of particulars of the visit in St. Mark, with those of the visit in St. Luke—Comparison of the visit in St. Matthew and St. Mark in conjunction, with that in St. Luke—Resulting conclusion, that the parties were throughout distinct 266—273

Objection to this conclusion, from the mention of the name of Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, as well as Johanna, in the account of St. Luke of the report of the women to the apostles—Resolvable into an omission in the accounts of St. Luke, but not an inconsistency with the above conclusion—Report of both parties, substantially the same 273—275

Supplementary character of the several accounts to be taken into consideration here—Proved by the examination of the accounts in detail, and fact of omissions in St. Matthew supplied by St. Mark—Scene of the account in St. Matthew, altogether placed outside the tomb; that of the accounts in St. Mark, altogether inside the tomb—Angel in St. Matthew, distinct from the angel in St. Mark, and both together equivalent to the two, in St. Luke or St. John—Objections of Celsus to the discrepancy of this part of the several accounts—Harmony of the address of the angel to the women, in the two accounts—Objection arising from the time of the visit, in the accounts respectively—Τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ, with the ellipsis of ὥρα—Proper sense of ὁψὲ σαββάτων—Illustrations of the use of ὁψὲ—Ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου of St. Mark, and λίαν πρωῒ, not consistent, if both understood of one point of time—Πρωῒ, the point of sunrise—Λίαν πρωῒ to be referred to the time when the women set out, ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου to that of their arrival at the sepulchre—Quarter, whence the women would set out to the tomb—Distance of Bethany from Calvary—Various computations of the periphery of Jerusalem—The Bezetha or Cænopolis of Josephus—Towers on the walls of Jerusalem, and the number of cubits between them—Line of circumvallation, drawn about Jerusalem by Titus—Meteor in the time of Cyril, from Calvary to Mount Olivet—Resulting conclusion, of the distance which the women would have to travel, and the probable time of their arrival at the sepulchre—Precise moment of the resurrection, probably what 275—287

Secondly, supplementary character of St. Luke—Implied in the dis-

tinctness of the visits themselves, to which his account is confined
 —Of distinct visits, St. Matthew or St. Mark would select the first ;
 and therefore St. Luke the second 287—288

Thirdly, supplementary character of St. John—The first of his two
 visits, the same with St. Matthew's or St. Mark's ; the second, with
 the second of St. Luke's—Double visit of Peter, a gratuitous as-
 sumption—Account of this single visit in each of the evangelists,
 consistent the one with the other 288—289

Relation of the account of the visit of Mary Magdalene in St. John, to
 that of the visit of Salome and Mary in St. Matthew and St. Mark
 —Internal evidence, that Mary of Magdala accompanied the other
 two on the way to the tomb—Nature of the approach to the tomb
 —Site of the holy sepulchre—Mary of Magdala sent back from the
 party, before their arrival at the tomb—Improbable in the highest
 degree, that she could have been a party to what afterwards passed
 at the tomb—Both parties of women departed again, before Mary's
 return with Peter and John—No objection, that the visit of Peter,
 which arose out of the report of Mary in particular, is said by
 St. Luke to have arisen out of the report of the women in general
 —Supplementary object of St. John's Gospel in this part of its
 accounts, our Lord's personal manifestation to Mary of Magdala,
 and the circumstances out of which it arose 289—295

Manifestations of our Lord, necessarily connected with the farther
 decision of these questions—Difficulty on this subject due to
 what—Number and order of these manifestations—First manifes-
 tation of Jesus alive again, made to Mary of Magdala, and to
 Mary by herself—Manifestation to Mary, entirely distinct from the
 manifestation to the women in St. Matthew—Manifestation to
 the women in St. Matthew, if not the first on Easter Day, not a
 manifestation on Easter Day at all—No room for the manifestation
 to the women in St. Matthew, before or after the other recorded
 appearances on Easter Day—Rule of proceeding, in the order of
 these manifestations—No personal appearance of Jesus to the
 women known to Cleopas and his companion, before their depar-
 ture to Emmaus—Report of one or both parties of the women, of
 the visit to the tomb, known to them 295—300

Second appearance on Easter Day, the appearance to the two disci-
 ples—Manifestations in St. Matthew, both referred to one and the

same final end, the account of the manifestation in Galilee—Steps in his Gospel, which gradually prepare the way for this account at last—Peculiarity of the manifestation itself, especially considered as the manifestation alluded to by St. Paul, and made to more than 500 at once—Resulting conclusion of the time, when a message, to prepare the way for such a manifestation as this, would be sent—Message not yet received, while the apostles were still in Jerusalem—Apostles in Jerusalem, a week at least after Easter Day—Motions of the apostles after the resurrection, in going to and from Jerusalem, specially directed by our Lord himself 300—307

Objections to the above explanation: first, in the words, *ὡς ἐπορεύοντο ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ*. Matth. xxviii. 9—Difficulty of supposing these words always a part of St. Matthew's Gospel—Marked in Griesbach, with the note of probably to be omitted—Wanting in the oldest MSS. and versions—Not known to the Fathers of the first five centuries: proved by quotations of the text without them—Interpolation itself, probably made at twice 307—310

Objection to the same explanation, secondly, in the place of Matthew xxviii. 11—15—Answer to the objection, by supposing that account a Trajection—Reasons which might have produced the Trajection 310—312

Harmonized detail of the accounts of the resurrection in general, agreeably to the principles thus laid down—Hour of *ἄριστον*, or prandium, with the ancients in general, or Jews in particular—Name of the companion of Cleopas—Appearance to Peter, confirmed by 1 Cor. xv. 5—Appearance to the Eleven, confirmed by 1 Cor. xv. 5—Appearance in Galilee, confirmed by 1 Cor. xv. 5—Τὸ ὄρος, traditionally Tabor—Probably the mountain near Capernaum—Appearance to James, 1 Cor. xv. 7—Conjectural object of it, to admonish the apostles to return to Jerusalem—Account of this appearance, in the Gospel according to the Hebrews—Appearance on Ascension Day, confirmed by 1 Cor. xv. 7—Harmony of the accounts of that appearance—Jewish and Julian date of Ascension day—Interval between the Ascension and the day of Pentecost—Conclusion of St. Mark's Gospel 312—320

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION I.

On the Supplemental relations of the Gospels 321—326

Objection to the supposed supplemental relation of the Gospels to each other, from the *apparent continuity* of each considered by itself 321

One Gospel discovered to be defective, and another supplementary to it, from the comparison of *parallel* accounts, agreeing in the outline throughout, and touching on each other repeatedly at intermediate points of the details 322—325

The matter interposed in such cases, unless it can be shewn not to be *fresh* matter, or to be inserted out of its place, necessarily supplementary 325—326

DISSERTATION II.

On the principle of Classification as applied to St. Luke's Gospel 327—333

The best confutation of the supposed classification in question, supplied by an harmony of the Gospels itself 327

The classification proposed, in assuming that St. Luke's Gospel is irregular, founded in a *petitio principii*—No such classification applicable to a Gospel, both regular in itself and supplementary to others 328—329

The principle of this classification, too artificial for the simplicity of Gospel historians—Suetonius' *Lives of the Cæsars*, no case in point to the composition of a Gospel history 329—330

Implied basis of this classification, the agreement of the things brought together, in the possession of some common nature 330—331

Not a single instance in the Gospel of St. Luke, of distinct events brought together on any such principle 331—332

What kind of arrangement of events might have been expected, in a Gospel constructed on such a principle 332—333

Peculiarity of narration, which does distinguish the Gospel of St. Luke, although not exclusively, what	333
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

DISSERTATION III.

<i>On the prevalence of the Greek language in Palestine, or other parts of the East</i>	334—350
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Connection of this inquiry with the determination of the question, In what language it is most probable St. Matthew's Gospel was written	334
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Testimony of Chærilus—Book of Ecclesiasticus—Second of Maccabees—Dialect of Ashdod or Azotus—Book of Enoch ..	334—336
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew—Hebrew versions of the Gospel of St. John and the Acts of the Apostles—Gospel of Nicodemus	336—337
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Hebrew words or phrases in the Gospel, or elsewhere—Vernacular Hebrew, distinct from the language of the Jews of the dispersion—Language of the native Jews in the time of Vespasian and Titus	337—338
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Hebrew forms of prayer—Hebrew, of the juggler Alexander—In the time of Cleopatra—Of Gordian the younger	338
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Hebrew or Syriac, in the time of Origen—Of Eusebius—Letters between Christ and Abgarus—Syriac or Hebrew, in the time of Jerome—Of Ambrose and Chrysostom—Of Theodorit—Of Sozomen—Epigram of Meleager of Gadara—Severianus of Gabala—Bardesanes Syrus—Harmodius—Ephraim Syrus,	338—341
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

<i>Μαβαθαί</i> —Herod Agrippa and the Alexandrine populace— <i>Μάρις</i> , <i>Μάχων</i> , Malchus, or Porphyry	341
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Languages spoken by Mithridates—Languages spoken at Dioscurias—Dialect of Mysia—Cappadocia—Hispania Bætica—Phrygia—Gaul—Corsica—Africa or Punic	342—344
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Greek language extinguished in some instances by native dialects—	
-------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Pæstum—Achæans on the Pontus—Tomos, Thessalonica—Aristides, and the Attic dialect	344—345
Native dialects in Egypt, Syria, and Upper Asia—Dialect of Egypt—Hieroglyphica of Horapollo—Language of Parthia or Armenia—Of Palmyra—Disputation of Archelaus and Manes—Apollonius of Tyana—Aristides—Dio Chrysostom—Ælian	345—347
Use of interpreters, to translate Latin into other languages—Titus—Paulus Æmilius—Constantine—Trajan—Tiridates—Latin, the state or official language under the empire—General, in the time of Plutarch—Circular letter of Constantine—Council of Antioch, Serdica, Sirmium—Photinus—Greek secretary of the emperors—Pulcheria—Estimation of Greek among the Romans, in comparison of Latin	347—349
Πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες, or gentile cities in Josephus—The language spoken in these, no argument of what would be spoken in the rest of Palestine.	349—350

DISSERTATION IV.

<i>On the reigns and succession of the Maccabæan Princes.</i>	351—355
Reigns of the Maccabees, from the first of Judas to the death of Simon, or the close of the First of Maccabees.	351
Reigns of the Maccabees, from the first year of John Hyrcanus to the last of queen Alexandra	352—353
Chronology of the rest of the period, from the accession of Hyrcanus the second to the end of the Maccabæan dynasty.	353
Misstatement of Josephus, with respect to the first year of Hyrcanus' priesthood	354
Distribution of the period, from B. C. 63. to B. C. 37, between Hyrcanus and Antigonus	354—355

DISSERTATION V.

On the time of the admission of Caius Cæsar to the Councils of Augustus 356—361

Age at which, according to the Ancyran monument of Dio Cassius, Caius and Lucius Cæsar were privileged to be present at the public councils 356—357

Language of Josephus, with respect to the presence of Caius at the deliberation on the will of Herod, whether for the first time or in the chief capacity 357—358

Age of young men at the assumption of the Toga Libera, under the republic, and in the time of the emperors 358—359

Time of the year with which this ceremony coincided, the Liberalia 359

Time of the ceremony, in the case of Caius and Lucius Cæsar 359—360

Whether Josephus, in his mention of the persons present at the council on the will of Herod, has confounded Caius with Lucius Cæsar 360

Objection hence derivable, to the supposition of this council's being held, and Herod's having died, U. C. 752. 361

DISSERTATION VI.

On the date of the Marriage of Archelaus and Glaphyra.. 362—373

Glaphyra, after the death of Juba, married to Archelaus. 362

Extant fragments of Juba—Supply no data to determine the year of his death 362—363

Work of Juba upon Arabia, demonstrative that he was not dead before Caius Cæsar's expedition into the East—Date of that expedition 363—364

Juba still alive, at the time of the rebellion of the Gætuli, U. C. 758. 364

Coins of the kings of Mauritania—Length of the reign of Juba

- thence determinable—Dominions of Juba—Death of Juba the elder, and Bocchus king of Mauritania—Marriage of Juba to Cleopatra—Epigram of Crinagoras 364—365
- Date of Eckhel for the first year of Juba, inconsistent with Josephus' testimony to the time when he was dead—Josephus confirmed by a coin of Ptolemy, son of Juba 365—366
- Language of Strabo, that Juba was lately dead when he was writing—Determination of the age of Strabo 366—367
- Language of Strabo, not to be too strictly construed, more especially with respect to the dates of contemporary events 367—368
- Reign of Juba, best supposed to bear date from the death of his father, U. C. 708—Year of his death thence determinable, from his coins, not before U. C. 756 368—369
- Coins of Ptolemy his son, which serve to shew that Juba died and Ptolemy began to reign, U. C. 759—Cæsarea, or games instituted by Juba—Personal history of Ptolemy—The son of Juba, and Cleopatra or Selene—Put to death by Caius, U. C. 793—Rebellion in Mauritania, excited by his death 369—371
- Earliest possible date of the marriage of Archelaus and Glaphyra, resulting from these premises 371—372
- Probable age of Glaphyra at the time—Glaphyra, daughter of Archelaus king of Cappadocia, and Glaphyra—Appointment of Archelaus to that kingdom—Marriage of Archelaus to Pythodoris—Date of the death of Polemo king of Pontus—Polemo the second, contemporary with Nero, &c. 372—373

DISSERTATION VII.

- On the Date of the Proconsular Authority of Tiberius...* 374—381
- Date of the triumph of Tiberius, and of his consequent association in the empire, capable of being confirmed from Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistolæ de Ponto* 374
- Date of the banishment of Ovid, and order of his compositions written after that event. 374—377

Rule of Ovid, to date the years of his exile from the winter season...	375
Place of the first allusion to the triumph of Tiberius, in the <i>Epistolæ de Ponto</i>	377
Celebration of this in the <i>Triumphus</i> of Ovid	377—378
Distinction of this triumph from that of Germanicus.....	378
This triumph also known to Ovid.....	378—379
Allusions in the <i>Tristia</i> to the war in Germany, U. C. 762—765.....	379
Lines of Ovid, upon the statues of Augustus, Tiberius, and Livia.....	379—380
Illustration from the <i>Epistolæ de Ponto</i> , of the fact of Germanicus' being recommended by Augustus to the senate, and the senate to Tiberius	380
Pomponius Flaccus, and his government in the vicinity of Ovid, consistent with his being at Rome U. C. 765—Proprætor of Mœsia, under Tiberius—Rhescuporis—Cotys	380—381

DISSERTATION VIII.

<i>The rate of travelling by sea or land, in ancient times, illustrated by Examples</i>	382—393
Examples, to prove that one who set out from Rome, even on the first of June, would not arrive in Judæa before the beginning or the middle of August	382—384
Examples of the greater delays of travelling in the winter season	384—385
General examples of the rate of travelling both in summer and in winter	385—388
Additional examples to the same effect	388—391
Particular proof of the assertion that the journey from Judæa to Rome, even in the summer, would take up six weeks at least...	391—393

DISSERTATION IX.

On the natural or physical Notices of Time, supplied by the Gospel Histories 394—412

Advantages of natural phenomena, to supply the defect of historical notices of time, illustrated by cases in point—Simplicity and antiquity of the division of the chronology of events into summers and winters—Object proposed, in the application of this principle to the chronology of the Gospel history 394—396

Natural notices of the *first* spring, supplied by the Gospel history 396—398

Natural notices of the *second* spring, supplied by the Gospel history 398

Objection to this last conclusion answered—Peculiarity of the climate of Judæa, with respect to pasturage—Season of rain in Judæa, what—Failure of the supplies of water, in the summer season—Periodic visitations of the locust—Use of straw or stubble, in the fodder of cattle—Limits within which supplies of green food might be had for the cattle—Not the effect of the autumnal rains to revive the face of the ground—Absurdity of supposing the first miracle of feeding, in the autumnal quarter before Passion-week—Winter in Judæa, inconsistent with the Gospel description of the circumstances of that miracle 398—405

Natural notice of the first *harvest*, supplied by the Gospel history—Times of barley harvest and wheat harvest in Judæa, respectively—Book of Enoch—Philo Judæus 405—406

Interval between this notice, and the two last—Absurdity of the only conceivable method of abridging it 406—408

Natural notice of the second *harvest* supplied by the Gospel history—Literal construction of this allusion—Distinction of this harvest from the last—Absurdity of supposing the one barley harvest and the other wheat harvest in the same year 408—410

Summing up of the argument—Minimum of the length of our Saviour's ministry determined by it—Necessary disproof of the

hypothesis of a one year's ministry, by it—Coincidence of the conclusion thus established with others, independently obtained, to the same effect 411—412

DISSERTATION X.

On the time of the imprisonment of John the Baptist, and of the marriage of Herod and Herodias 413—429

Date of the marriage in question, not coincident with that of the war of Herod and Aretas—Defeat of Herod by Aretas—Death of Philip the tetrarch—Imprisonment of John at Machærus—Escape of the daughter of Aretas thither 412—414

Salome, daughter of Herodias—Her age at the death of John—Age of marriage in females anciently—Marriage of Herodias to her first husband Herod 415—417

History of Herod Agrippa, between the death of Drusus, son of Tiberius, and his last return to Rome, before the death of Tiberius—Herod Antipas and Herodias already married, at what time..... 417—418

Statement of Josephus of the time of this return, before the death of Tiberius—Intermediate history of Agrippa, between leaving Tiberias and returning to Rome—Death of Flaccus, governor of Syria—Vitellius, his successor 418—419

Between what times Tiberius might be found at Capreæ, by Agrippa, at his return—Movements of Tiberius, between the death of Sejanus and his own decease—Prefects of the city—Piso, Ælius Lamia, Cossus, Sanguinius Maximus—Trial of Eutychus—Imprisonment of Agrippa 419—421

Journey of Herod the tetrarch to Rome, before his marriage to Herodias—Date of the foundation of Tiberias—Time of the year of his departure—Compact with Herodias—Compact known to John—Espousals among the Jews, equivalent to marriage—Message of John, preliminary to his imprisonment—Resulting date of this event..... 420—424

Marriage delayed by the remonstrances of John—Enmity of Herodias to John—Time of the death of John—Nature of the feast

celebrating by Herod at the time—A king's accession, his birthday 424—425

Chronological arrangement of the preceding particulars—Visit of Herod Antipas to Tyre—Agrippa not at Jerusalem, at the time of the dedication of the shields by Pilate—Obscurity of the accounts of Josephus, with respect to these events, probably designed—Tradition, that the body of John was buried in Sebaste—Traditionary account of the disposal of the head of John. 425—427

Name of Herodias' first husband—Philip, probably an interpolation in the Gospel text—Time, when Herod Antipas was most likely to hear first of Jesus 428—429

DISSERTATION XI.

On the date of the Exodus, and of the first passover. 430—481

Coincidence of the date of the Nativity with the date of the Creation, and that of both with the Vernal Equinox 430—431

Vernal Equinox, in the year of the Nativity—Precession of the Equinox, and rate of precession—April 5 the Vernal Equinox, B. C. 1560—B. C. 1560, the year of the Exodus—Proof of this position, *a priori*, by tracing the course of events from the Creation to the Exodus 431—434

Hebrew and Septuagint chronology—Tradition that the world was destined to last six thousand years—Division of millennia, according to the prophecy of Enoch or Elias—Coincidence of the Bible date of the birth of Christ with the close of the fourth millennium—Doctrine of the millenary reign, connected with this division of millennia—Scriptural sense of *αἰών*, or *αἰῶνες* 434—437

Interval between the call of Abraham and the birth of Christ—Call of Abraham, dated from the call into Charran—Interval between the call into Canaan, and the Exodus—Interval between the call into Charran and the call into Canaan—Interval between the Creation and the call into Charran—Age of Terah, at the birth of his three sons—Abraham, Terah's second son—Age of Terah, at his death 437—442

THE CONTENTS.

xxxiii

Proof that B. C. 1560 was the year of the Exodus, *a posteriori*, by tracing the course of events from the Exodus to the time of the building of the temple442

Date of the Exodus—Date of the division of the lands—Age of Caleb443—444

'Αρχὴ of the cycle of Sabbatic years—'Αρχὴ of the cycle of years of Jubile444—445

Date of the death of Joshua—Interval between the Exodus and the time of Jephthah—Interval between the time of Jephthah and the death of Eli445—446

Interval between the death of Eli and the end of the reign of David—Length of the administration of Samuel—Length of the reign of Saul—St. Paul's definition of the interval, in the synagogue of Pisidian Antioch447—450

Position of the last chapter of the Book of Judges.....449

Date of the building of the temple—Peculiarity of this date in the age of the world—Temple, a type of the body of Christ—Temple of Ezekiel—Coincidences observable in the history of the first and second temple450—452

General accuracy of the Bible chronology, in the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah, proved by the correctness of the date of the fourteenth of Hezekiah—Sabbatic year, in the fourteenth of Hezekiah—Sum of the reigns of the kings of Judah, from Solomon to the captivity—Allowance for current years, reckoned as complete.....452—454

Date of the building of the temple, in the First of Kings—Explained, by referring it to the commencement of the administration of the Judges—First year of Othniel—Date of the death of the last of the elders who outlived Joshua—Interval from that time to the time of Jephthah—The last year of a particular servitude, reckoned as the first of the deliverance from it—Age of Othniel at his death—Various readings of the numbers in Kings—Generations between the death of Joshua and the accession of David—Passage of

the high priesthood from the line of Phinehas unto that of Ithamar.....	454—458
Calculation of Vernal Equinoxes—True date of the Vernal Equinox in the year of the Nativity, and consequent date in the year of the Exodus, answering to it	458—459
April 5 in the Julian year, equivalent to April 3 in the Tropical or natural—Correction of the civil year by Cæsar—Erroneous assumption of the length of the natural year—Erroneous determination of the cardinal points in the Julian year, by Sosigenes—Perpetuation of his error in the modern Julian year—Correction of the calendar by pope Gregory, and its object—Vernal Equinox, at the time of the council of Nice—Eclipses above quoted, calculated in dates of the Gregorian year—Adaptation of these dates to the corresponding dates in the natural—Calculation of the eclipse before the Nativity, by Mr. Jenkyns—April 3, B. C. 4, the date of the Nativity, as well as of the Vernal Equinox, B. C. 1560.....	459—464
Proof that April 3 or April 5, B. C. 1560, coincided with the seventh day of the week, as April 3 or April 5 did in the year of the Nativity—Date of the passage of the Red sea—Date of the supply of quails, and of the first of the sabbaths—The tenth of Nisan, or April 3, a Saturday	464—467
Confirmation of the above conclusions, by the succession of <i>νυχθήμερα</i> from A. M. 1 to the Exodus—Mean length of the natural year—B. C. 4004, a great astronomical epoch—Date of the Vernal Equinox, B. C. 4004—Number of <i>νυχθήμερα</i> and weeks, from thence to the Exodus	467—469
Application of the same computation, from A. M. 1 to the year of the Nativity—Mean length of the natural year, according to Delambre—Rate of precession, answerable thereto—Discrepancy of one day, between the calculated result, and the fact established that B. C. 4, April 3, or April 5 was a Saturday—This discrepancy explained, by taking into account the effect of the miracles in the time of Hezekiah and Joshua	469—475
Date of the first of the Levitical passovers, and place in the days of	

the week, the year after the Exodus, the same as at the time of the Exodus—Passover capable of being celebrated, B. C. 1559, on March 30—Calculation of the full moon, B. C. 1559—Date of the erection of the tabernacle—Date of the commencement of the tabernacle service—Date of the supply of quails—Date of the full moon, the year of the Exodus—Neomenia of Nisan, in the year of the Exodus, the Vernal Equinox; and both coincident with the first day of the week. 475—481

DISSERTATION XII.

On the Chronology of the Kingdoms of Judah and of Israel.
482—546

Table of the reigns of the kings of Judah and Israel, from the first of Solomon to the fourteenth of Hezekiah 482—483

Table of the reigns of the kings of Judah, from the fourteenth of Hezekiah to the eleventh of Zedekiah 483—484

Double date of the beginnings of the reigns in question—Length of the reigns in each instance referred to a nominal ἀρχή—Synchronisms of one reign with another referred to the true. 484

Inductive proof of the fact of this distinction, through each of the reigns in succession—Numeral notes at 2 Chron. xv. 19. xvi. 1—Interregnum between Elah and Omri—Death of Ahab. . 484—487

First of Ahaziah king of Israel, the nineteenth of Jehoshaphat—Corruption of *nineteen* for *seventeen*—Association of the sons of the kings of Israel or Judah with their fathers, in their lifetime, a gratuitous hypothesis 488—489

First of Jehoram, king of Israel, the twentieth of Jehoshaphat—Interpolation of 2 Kings i. 17—Cases of interpolation, in other instances—First of Ahaziah king of Judah, the twelfth of Jehoram king of Israel. 489—492

First of Jehu and first of Athaliah—Corruption of the numeral note at 2 Kings xiii. 10, and 2 Kings xv. 1—Interregnum of twelve years in the succession of the kings of Judah, between Amaziah and Uzziah, a gratuitous hypothesis. 492—494

First of Zachariah—Interregnum of twelve years in the kingdom

of Israel—Twentieth of Pekah, the third of Ahaz—Interpolation of 2 Kings xv. 30	494—496
Invasion of Judah by Rezin and Pekah—Birth of Maher-shalal-hash-baz—Reduction of Samaria and Damascus by Tiglath-pileser	496—497
First of Hoshea, the thirteenth of Ahaz—Interregnum of nine years in the kingdom of Israel—Various readings of the reign of Pekah—Capture of Samaria, and extinction of the kingdom of Israel	497—498
Fourteenth of Hezekiah—Invasion of Sennacherib—Date of the fifteen years, added to his life—Embassy of the king of Babylon—Merodach-baladan, the Mardoc-empadus of Ptolemy's canon	498—500
First of Josiah, and last of Josiah—Invasion of Pharaoh-Necho—First of Jehoiakim—Interval from the thirteenth of Josiah to the fourth of Jehoiakim, according to Jeremiah.....	500—502
First of Nebuchadnezzar, the third of Jehoiakim—Three months of Jehoiachin in the eighth of Nebuchadnezzar—Death of Jehoiakim— <i>Ἀρχή</i> of the reign of Zedekiah—Ezekiel's date of the captivity— <i>Thirtieth</i> year of Ezekiel—Probable corruption of Ezekiel i. 1—First of Zedekiah, ninth of Nebuchadnezzar—Eleventh of Zedekiah, nineteenth of Nebuchadnezzar—Date of the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem—Synchronism at Ezekiel xl. 1...502—505	
First of Nebuchadnezzar, according to Jeremiah—Date of his captivity, according to Daniel—True date of the <i>ἀρχή</i> of the seventy years' captivity—Subsequent captivities besides the first—Length of the captivity seventy years	505—506
First of Nebuchadnezzar, the third of Daniel's captivity—Reconciliation of this date with that of Jeremiah—Reign of Nebuchadnezzar, represented at forty-five years and at forty-three, respectively—Length of his reign, forty-five years according to scripture—Siege of Tyre—Reduction of Egypt—Madness of Nebuchadnezzar—Nebuchadnezzar associated with his father . . .	506—508
Canon of Ptolemy—First of Evil-merodach—Evil-merodach the	

same with Belshazzar—Neriglissar—Laborosoarchod—Isaiah xiv. 29—Nabonadius, no connection of the family of Nebuchadnezzar—Belshazzar, the son of Nebuchadnezzar—Book of Baruch—Reign of Evil-merodach and Belshazzar, according to the canon, and according to Daniel—Testimony of Daniel v. 30, 31—Daniel x. 13—Prince of Persia and Grecia—Twenty-one years between the death of Belshazzar, and the accession of Darius at Babylon—The same, in the canon, between Evil-merodach and Nabonadius—Years of Darius at Babylon in the canon, merged in those of Cyrus	508—515
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Various circumstantial proofs of the truth of the above conclusions—Feast of Belshazzar, in a time of peace—Sacea at Babylon—The queen-mother, or wife of Nebuchadnezzar—King of Babylon, at the time of its capture by Cyrus, not killed—Various accounts of the capture of Babylon—Daniel survived the captivity—Age of Daniel at the return of the Jews	515—518
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Darius the Mede, Cyaxares—Ahasuerus, or Assuerus, Astyages—Book of Tobit—Siege of Nineve—Age of Tobit, when he lost his sight—Last of Sennacherib, and first of Esarhaddon—Death of Tobit, and siege of Nineve—Length of the siege—Nebuchadnezzar or Nabuchodonosor, commander at it—Expedition of Pharaoh-Necho—Nebuchadnezzar, contemporary with Astyages—Chronology of the reign of Cyaxares, king of Media—Scythian invasion of Asia—Astyages, commanding for Cyaxares at the siege of Nineve—Cyaxares, or Darius the Mede, the <i>cousin</i> of Evil-merodach—Amyhea, wife of Nebuchadnezzar—Marriage of Aryenis to Astyages—Eclipse of Thales—Birth of Cyaxares, or Darius the Mede—Birth of Cræsus—Birth of Cyrus—Age of Cyrus at his death—Evil-merodach, Cyaxares, Cræsus, Cyrus, strictly <i>ὁμήλικες</i> —Marriageable age in the East	518—527
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Ezekiel iv. 5, 6—Various readings of the numbers in those texts—End of the numbers, and beginning answerable to it—B. C. 1018, the year of the numbering in the reign of David—2 Sam. xxiv. 13, and 1 Chron. xxi. 12—B. C. 1017, a sabbatic year...527—530	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Chronology of the latter half of the reign of David—Age of Solomon, when he came to the throne—Death of Amon—Return of Absalom—2 Samuel xv. 7, 8—Death of Absalom—Three years'	
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

famine—Children of Absalom—Age of Mephibosheth, at the rebellion of Absalom	530—533
Coincidences of Egyptian with sacred history—Pharaoh-Necho—Pharaoh-Hophra—Seventy years' captivity of Tyre—Siege of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar—Ionian war—Forty years' desolation of Egypt—Reduction of Egypt by Cyrus.....	534—535
Length of the reign of Saul—Age of Ishbosheth—Children of Saul—Age of Jonathan at his death—Age of Saul, when he began to reign	535—537
Testimony of 1 Sam. xiii. 1, 2—Difficulties connected with its literal construction—Limits of the military age anciently	537—538
Explanation of the above texts—Statement of Josephus, that Samuel died in the eighteenth of Saul—True date of the death of Samuel—First eighteen years of Saul, part also of the administration of Samuel—Birth of Samuel—Age, when he succeeded Eli—Age, in the eighteenth of Saul—Date of the sole reign of Saul...	539—542
Advantages of this explanation—Birth of Jonathan—Birth of David—Friendship of David and Jonathan—Age of David, when anointed by Samuel—Age, when he slew Goliath—Subjugation of the Philistines in the days of Samuel—Descendants of Eli, from Phinehas to Abiathar—Date of the death of Samuel—Traditional length of the reign of Saul—The 450 years' date of St. Paul	542—546

SUPPLEMENT TO DISSERTATION XII.

<i>Further consideration of Daniel x. 13</i>	547—584
Supposed reference of Daniel x. 13 to x. 2, and apparent probability of it	547—548
Answer to the objection—Equally probable at first sight of Daniel ix. 1, 2—Inconsistent with the circumstances of the case, and the dignity of the parties who appeared unto Daniel, or are alluded to in this instance—The second Person in the Trinity—The Prince of the kingdom of Persia—Gabriel—Michael—Partly resolvable into the inaccuracy, and <i>prima facie</i> construction of the English version.....	548—551

Tenth chapter of Daniel, historical or recapitulatory throughout—
Specially connected with the eighth—Division of the Book of
Daniel into the historical and prophetical parts—Limits of each—
Chronological series of his visions as such, from the first of Bel-
shazzar to the third of Cyrus—Interposition of the prophecy of
the seventy weeks 551—553

Reference of the vision in the tenth, to the vision in the eighth—
Instrument employed to interpret the visions of Daniel, the angel
Gabriel—Phelamouni, or Palmoni, descriptive of what...553—556

Confirmation of this conclusion—Daniel's setting his heart to under-
stand, the understanding of his visions—Daniel in Persia at the
vision, chap. viii. 2, &c.—Ulai, the Eulæus—Daniel on the Tigris at
x. i. 4—Angel, to return to Persia after the vision—Strengthening
of Darius by the angel, in the first of his reign. 556—559

The tenth chapter of Daniel historical throughout—Amended version
of Dan. x. 12—14. 20 to xi. 2—Parenthetic character of parts of these
—Coming of the prince of Javan or Grecia—Strengthening of
Darius by Gabriel—Return, to war with the prince of Per-
sia 559—563

One and twenty days began in the third of Belshazzar, and expired
in the first of Darius—Connection of the strengthening of Darius
with the purposes of Providence in behalf of the Jews—Oppo-
sition of the prince of Persia, not over in the third of Cyrus—
Daniel's fasting and mourning, probably due to the success of the
adversaries of the Jews in the reign of Cyrus 563—566

Prince of Persia and prince of Grecia, designations of what—Opin-
ion of bishop Horsley with respect to both—Objections to this
explanation—Princes of Persia, not recognised in Scripture—
Prince of Persia or Grecia in Daniel, analogous to the prince of
Tyrrus in Ezekiel—Hebrew designation of the prince of Persia in-
applicable to a party or faction—Anachronism involved in the
bishop's explanation—A party or faction an abstraction, the prince
of Persia a reality of some kind—The Prince of Persia, a superhu-
man being as much as Gabriel or Michael 567—572

Doctrine of tutelar angels, as opposed by the bishop, not involved in
this question—Charged by the bishop with consequences to which

- it is not liable—Its truth or falsehood, to be decided by scripture testimony alone—Order of relation and subordination, to be presumed in the invisible world, as well as the visible 572—574
- Doctrine of tutelar and even of individual guardian angels, resolvable into primitive tradition—Falsely attributed to Rabbis or Gentiles—Grounded on the Septuagint version of Deut. xxxii. 8. . 574—575
- Designation of the prince of Persia and Grecia, as archons or rulers, scriptural—Styles and titles, applied by St. Paul and St. Peter to the angels collectively—Not confined to the good, but equally applied to the bad. 575—576
- Relation of archon or ruling principles, over all but the people of God upon earth, restricted to what class of angels—Proofs of this position from the Scriptures of the New Testament—Archon of Persia, archon of Grecia, archon of Tyre, in unison with this description—Equally so, the archon of archons, or archon of the people of God, the archangel Michael 576—580
- Warfare of such principles as these upon each other, not to be explained at present—Possible, that one of its modes may be by working upon and by men—Combination of the prince of Persia and the prince of Grecia, against Gabriel and Michael, in the first of Darius, a mystery—Persia and Greece, important countries in the destinies both of the Jewish and Christian churches—Anti-christ, whence to arise 580—582
- Age of Daniel at his captivity—Age, in the third of Cyrus—Decree of Cyrus might be dictated by Daniel—Tower at Ecbatana, reputed to have been built by Daniel—Tower or palace at Achmetha, in the Book of Ezra—Probable date of the death of Daniel—Absolute length of time in the Book of Daniel. 582—584

DISSERTATION XIII.

- Further Consideration of the Opinions of the most ancient Christians upon the preceding topics* 585—642
- Justin Martyr—Date of the first Apology—Birthday of Severus, and year of the consulate of Erucius and Clarus 585
- Notes of time in the Apology—Persons addressed in the opening

sentence—Lucius Ælius Verus Cæsar—Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Lucius Verus—Name of Verissimus, of Marcus Aurelius.....	585—587
Rescript of Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus—Prohibition of castration—Deification of Antinous—Barchochab—Second Jewish war.....	587—588
Marcion of Pontus—Age of Marcion—Age of Celsus—Martyrdom of Polycarp.....	588—590
Second Apology of Justin, written when one king as such was reigning—Second Apology possibly prior to the first....	590—591
Musonius, contemporary with Justin—Musonii, before and after Justin—Cornutus of Leptis not put to death by Nero—Persius, the satirist—Asinius Pollio—Hermogenes of Tarsus—Musanus, the Christian writer.....	591—593
Lollius Urbicus, prefect of the city—Oratio of Apuleius, De Magia—Pudentilla—Avitus and Maximus, proconsuls of Africa—Gavius or Cavius Maximus—Time of the proconsulate, after the consulate—Proconsulate of Agricola—Proconsulate of Gordian the Elder—Proconsulate of Silanus—Urbicus, governor of the Regio Veneta—Acta of Justin—Rusticus, urbis præfectus—Junius Rusticus, preceptor of Marcus.....	593—597
Crescens the Cynic—Testimony of Tatian to the death of Justin—Salaries of the sophists, rhetores, or philosophers, under the emperors—Aristocles of Pergamus—Salary of Quintilian at Rome—The Museum at Alexandria—Destruction of the Bruchium—Αἱ μὺναια or ἐπὶ μὺναια—Salary in the reign of Severus.....	597—599
Rise of the heresy of Tatian—Date of the martyrdom of Justin—Rise of Montanism.....	598—600
Irenæus—Opinions of the Valentinians—Interval between the resurrection and ascension, according to the Valentinians—Number of Æons recognised by this sect—Sige and Bythus—Æons of Ptolemæus and Secundus—Age of Valentinus—Theudas, his preceptor, an hearer of St. Paul.....	600—602
Age of our Lord at his baptism, and when he entered on his ministry,	

- according to Irenæus—In what sense, admits of explanation—Perfect age, or age of a master, according to Irenæus—Misconstruction of Irenæus, of John viii. 57—Old age supposed to begin at fifty—Various reading of forty for fifty—Number of passovers supposed by Irenæus 602—606
- Opinion of Irenæus not singular—*Ἀντικείμενα* of Stephen Gobarus—Valentinian date of the Nativity, according to Epiphanius, placed it in the spring—Opinion that Christ was born at seven months old—Authority for these dates, not wanting—Syncellus—Fragment ascribed to Alexander bishop of Jerusalem—Possible origin of these misstatements—Corruption of names and numbers in Epiphanius. 606—608
- Clemens Alexandrinus—Dates of the Baptism, the Nativity, or the Passion, all referred to the spring—Interval, according to Clemens, between the death of Commodus and the birth of Christ—Corruption of numbers, in the text of Clemens—Varronian and Catonian reckoning of the years of the city—Date of the creation, whether fixed by Clemens. 608—612
- Supposed interval of forty-two years, according to Clemens, between the Passion and the destruction of Jerusalem—Followed by Origen and Jerome—Interval of forty years—True of no date but the sixteenth of Tiberius—Length of our Saviour's ministry, according to Clemens 612—614
- Tertullian—Probable that Tertullian dated the Nativity in the spring—Age of our Lord at his Passion—Exposition of the prophecy of the seventy weeks 614—615
- Origen—Opinions of Origen at different times, of the length of our Saviour's ministry—Dates and order of the above quotations—Biography of Origen—Age, at the time of his work against Celsus, and his commentary on St. Matthew—Persecution of Severus—Date of the work against Celsus—Length of our Lord's ministry according to Origen, more than two years, but less than three 615—620
- Hippolytus Portuensis—Date of the Nativity according to Hippolytus—Latin Chronicon, ascribed to Hippolytus—Placed the Nativity in the spring—Portus Romanus—Siege of Rome by Alaric

- Interval between the Nativity and Passion, according to Hippolytus—Paschal calendar of Hippolytus—Nature of the double Octaëteric cycle—Notices in the calendar—Γένεσις Χριστοῦ and Πάθος Χριστοῦ—The Nativity and the Passion, and the times of each—Computus Paschalis of Cyprian—Fragment of Hippolytus Thebanus, ascribed to Hippolytus Portuensis 620—625
- Archelaus—Rise of Manichæanism—Date of the Disputatio . 625—626
- Arnobius—Age of Arnobius 626—627
- Eusebius—Interval between the resurrection and the ascension, apparently supposed by Eusebius—Explained from Theodorit—Age of Theodorit 627—628
- Cyril of Jerusalem—Julianus Imperator—Date of Julian's work against Christianity 628—629
- Epiphanius—Dates of Epiphanius for the principal events of the Gospel history—Date of the Nativity, the thirty-third of Herod—Distinction of the Gemini from Rufus, or Fusius, and Rubellius—Date of the Adversus Hæreses, and Ancoratus. 629—630
- Prudentius—Age of Prudentius—Date of the Nativity, Dec. 25—Apostolical Constitutions—Augustin—Cyril, Contra Julianum—Πολιτεία of Metrophanes and Alexander—Diodorus of Tarsus—Cassiodorus—Martyrium Pauli—Remarkable exactness of its dates—Date of the Nativity in the Evangelium Infantiae . . . 630—633
- St. John, living at the beginning of the reign of Trajan—Irenæus—Eusebius—Jerome—Clemens Alexandrinus—Story of St. John and the young man—Julius Pollux 633—635
- Banishment of St. John—Tertullian—The caldron of boiling oil—Origin—Acta of Timothy—St. John buried at Ephesus—Dates of Jerome—Dates of Augustin—Date of Theophylact—Dates of Suidas—Dates of the paschal Chronicon—Hippolytus Portuensis—Hippolytus the younger—Probable date of the death and the birth of St. John 635—638
- Dates of Epiphanius—Date of the return of St. John from exile—Date of his Gospel—St. John and Polycarp—St. John and Cerinthus or Ebion 638—639

Date of the Apocalypse, in the commentary of Arethas—Date of the ascension implied by it—Tradition, that the apostles continued fourteen years at Jerusalem—Probable date when St. John permanently left Jerusalem—Length of time for which the Virgin survived the ascension—Assumption of the Virgin—Time when St. John settled at Ephesus—Life of St. John by Symeon Metaphrastes—Epistle of Dionysius the Areopagite, to St. John—Scholia of Maximus..... 639—642

DISSERTATION XIV.

On the date of the battle of Pharsalia643—663

Controversy of De Guischart and De Lo-Looz—Date of the battle of Pharsalia, August 9, and of the death of Pompey, Sept. 29, both in the unrectified year, inadmissible 643

Course of proceedings, from the time that Cæsar took the field, U. C. 705, to the battle of Pharsalia—Ingress of the brumal quarter—*Præcipitaverat*—The month Merkedonius, U. C. 706—Time of the opening of the sea, in the Roman and Grecian year...643—646

Commencement of the siege of Dyrrachium—Time of the ripening of the corn in Greece—Reduction of Spain, U. C. 705—Raising of the siege—Date of the arrival at Pharsalia—Cicero, not present at the battle of Pharsalia—Omens before the battle—Saying of Favonius—Time of the Comitia 646—649

Movements of Pompey after the battle—Account of the same things by Lucan—Arrival at Paphos—Arrival at Pelusium—Etesian winds—Motions of Cæsar—Date of the death of Pompey—Birth-day of Pompey 649—652

Arrival of Cæsar at Alexandria—Date and duration of the Alexandrine war—Reduction of Alexandria—Length of the residence of Cæsar in Egypt—*Ἀντρονομία* of Antioch—Artemisius in the year of Antioch—Cæsar at Ziela 652—655

Obscurity of the date of the battle of Pharsalia, at an early period—Similar uncertainty about the age of Pompey—Contemporary calendars 655

Intercalary years, from U. C. 702 to 708—Oratio pro Milone—Death

of Clodius—Ludicrous date of Cicero—Curio—The intercalation extraordinary, U. C. 708	655—657
Intercalary years in the Fasti Triumphales—Year of Numa—Periodic intervals of three years, between successive intercalations—Intercalary rule of the Grecian year—Cicero's Oratio pro P. Quintio	657—659
Vernal equinox, in the time of Dionysius Halicarnassensis—Ver sacrum—Dates of eclipses, solar or lunar, in the year of Numa, and in the modern tables—Battle of Pydna—Time when Æmilius took the field—Date of the Virgiliarum Occasus in Africa, U. C. 708—Date of the victory over Juba—Date of the battle of Munda—The Liberalia—Date of the battle in the Kalendaria—Life of Augustus, by Nicolaus of Damascus.	659—663

HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS.

DISSERTATIONS.

DISSERTATION XXXIV.

On the notices of time supplied by Luke xii.

I HAVE elsewhere ^a asserted that the twelfth chapter of St. Luke's Gospel contains numerous indications of the period to which it belongs; and that as the concluding period of our Lord's ministry. If the proof of this position can be established, the error committed by such Harmonies as place this chapter before even the beginning to teach in parables, that is, the middle of our Saviour's ministry, must be apparent without further comment. They introduce an anachronism of nearly eighteen months in extent.

The foundation of this mistake, which is the supposed identity of Luke xi. 14, and what follows, with the parallel instance of dispossession and its consequences, related by St. Matthew, has sufficiently, I hope, been overthrown in the preceding Dissertation. Yet among the ill consequences of the mistake, so long as it remains uncorrected, this must necessarily be one; that we are thereby deprived of the means of appreciating rightly the force, the beauty, the propriety of one of the longest, and most admirable of our Lord's discourses in public. In order to the due percep-

^a Dissertation xxxi. Vol. ii. 537.

tion of such qualities in a given instance, regard must necessarily be had to the time when the discourse was delivered; to the occasion, which called it forth; to the circumstances and situation of the speaker and of his hearers at the time, as well as to the topics or sentiments themselves. Much might be said with fitness and effect, at one time, which would not be apposite nor in character at another.

To instance only in the virtue of Christian watchfulness, and so much of the ensuing discourse, from verse 35 downwards, as is devoted to it; a virtue which, at no period during the actual presence of Christ upon earth, could have any room for its exertion, or begin to be practically incumbent upon his followers. For being altogether founded on the doctrine, and on the expectation of some second coming of Christ, it was dependent conditionally on the previous fact of his departure; and until that had taken place, by his personal removal into heaven, no principle of duty, with a view exclusively to his return, could as yet be in force. Reasonably then might it be expected that the first mention of such a duty, and the proper arguments by which it was to be substantiated, would both occur towards the close of our Lord's ministry solely; when the time of his departure was at hand. If the place of the chapter is rightly assigned by me, this expectation is verified in the present instance; and it is still more indubitably true of the next, and the only remaining instance of a discourse upon the same topic, Matt. xxiv. 42, and the parallel places of St. Mark and of St. Luke; almost to the end of the prophecy upon Mount Olivet.

More examples of the same accommodation of the topics of the discourse to the time, when we suppose it to have been delivered, might be pointed out *now*; were

it not that this would be to anticipate that very examination of those topics in detail, which is requisite to the confirmation of the assertion alluded to above. To this examination then, but no further than may suffice for that purpose, I shall accordingly proceed.

That the chapter contains the particulars of a series of discourses, all belonging to the same period of time, may be proved by various considerations.

First, the reference at the beginning to the collection of a numerous multitude, during something else which had been going on meanwhile, is clearly to the circumstances related in the preceding chapter; more especially, to the time taken up by the sitting at meat, and by the protracted conversation, consequent upon it, in the house of the Pharisee. The same reference is implied in the nature of the topic, first insisted on, the ζύμη τῶν Φαρισαίων, or ὑπόκρισις; for that is best explained upon the principles of association, by the recollection of what had just occurred; not merely with respect to those pretensions to superior purity and virtue, which were instanced at xi. 38, 39, but also to that series of captious interrogations, designed to make our Lord commit himself in some manner or other, which is alluded to xi. 53, 54.

Secondly, when he returned into public, and had begun to address those about him, they were his disciples whom he addressed *first*; which clearly implies that, some time in the course of the same occasion, he must have addressed the people also. Accordingly, this is seen to have happened in two different instances, one xii. 13–21, and the other xii. 54—the end; to one or to both of which the Evangelist must consequently refer. Now there is this circumstance of distinction between them; that, in the second, our Lord spoke to the multitude of his own accord; in the first, in consequence of an

interruption: in the second, upon a general subject connected with his ministry; in the first, upon a particular topic suggested by the interruption itself. The second then was the more likely of the two to be referred to; and the second is the conclusion of the chapter. But if the end and the beginning of a certain discourse belong to the same point of time, the intermediate parts, whatever be the subject to which they relate, cannot belong to a different one.

Besides which, the topic of this last address to the people is evidently connected with the demand of an extraordinary sign; and verse tenth, in the course of the original address to the disciples, is connected with the fact of the blasphemy against the Son of man, as contradistinguished to the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost: both which were subjects suggested by recent events, and largely discussed a little before. It follows then that the *whole* of this twelfth chapter is strictly consecutive upon the course of proceedings from xi. 14 forwards; and it is not less apparent that xiii. 1-9 at least is strictly consecutive upon it: so that from xi. 14 to xiii. 9, we possess a continuous account of events, belonging to either the *whole* or to some *one* and the *same* part of one day.

This conclusion being established, the substance of 35-48, which is in general the doctrine of Christian watchfulness, besides being parabolic in its nature, and therefore not a fit subject for the present work; as far as it was qualified to supply any argument respecting the time of the chapter, has been in fact anticipated. The next division, which contains either clear or presumptive intimations to the same effect, is that which concludes the chapter—from verse 49-59; distributable into two parts; one from 49-53, the other from 54-59: the former, a continuation of the address to the

disciples, and the latter, the substance of an address to the people.

In the first of these divisions itself, there is also a double reference ; one, to the speaker, 49, 50, the other, to the parties addressed, and consequently the disciples, 51-53. Upon each of these we may observe in common that it would be in vain to search for the connection of either with the discourse which goes before, in any community of topics, or in the usual laws which regulate the transition of ideas : nor in any principle but that of the proximity of the close of our Lord's personal ministry, and of the natural effect, in reference both to himself and to his hearers, which the contemplation of that proximity was likely to produce upon his mind.

For to consider the latter division first. The address to the disciples is obviously levelled against something in their present opinions or persuasions, concerning the speaker and the final event of his coming, which the result would prove to be diametrically the reverse of the truth. This same thing, it cannot admit of a question, was their persuasion of the nature of the kingdom of the Messiah, or of what would be the effect of the appearance of Christ both upon him and upon them. Their minds at this present time were possessed with one idea, that his kingdom would be temporal, and the immunity of his person perpetual ; so that, before the event of the crucifixion itself, they could not comprehend the most simple and direct assurances of the fact, because they could not conceive the possibility, of his future sufferings. Much less were they prepared to entertain the distinct apprehension of those personal dangers and inconveniences, which, under the general name of persecution emanating from the enmity of their unbelieving countrymen,

were sometime to redound upon themselves who believed in Christ.

What however I would particularly observe is this ; that the substance of these verses, in St. Luke, occurred before, and at a much earlier period, not less than a year from the present time, at Matt. x. 34–37 or 39 : where, with the same specific allusion to the future fortunes of the disciples, in consequence of their master's coming, there was none to our Lord's own ; with the same general prediction of the fact, there was no such express intimation of the instant proximity of the fact, of persecution and suffering, as concerned either him or them, like that which is here conveyed in the terms $\eta\delta\eta\ \alpha\nu\eta\phi\theta\eta$, and still more in those of the $\alpha\pi\omicron\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\upsilon$. It is reasonable to infer that the *time* of the fulfilment of the prediction was much nearer now than then ; for, if that was the case, it would account for the distinction at once.

With respect to the first of the same divisions ; that apostrophe to our Lord's personal sufferings, so forcible, as to shew that he felt them in prospect deeply ; so abrupt, as to seem the effect of a sudden emotion ; is by nothing so easily to be accounted for, as by the contemplation of the near approach of his passion itself. Neither the kind nor the degree of those sufferings was unknown to our Lord from the first ; and if the prospect of their futurity, combined with this perfect understanding of their nature, could not but be at all times revolting to the $\acute{o}\mu\omicron\iota\omicron\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ of his common humanity, it is probable it would be most so when the crisis was nearest at hand. The intensity of the agony in Gethsemane, whatever else might contribute towards it, must partly if not mainly be ascribed to this cause. What I have to observe here also is that, if the idea of his personal sufferings is seen to have ever, even mo-

mentarily, disturbed the equanimity of our Lord, it was only on the eve of their arrival. At the beginning of his ministry, when they were yet comparatively distant, and even when two thirds of its duration were over^b, he alluded to their futurity with the same calmness and composure, which he displayed at last in the endurance of them.

And that the words do contain an allusion to these sufferings is proved by verse 50, in the occurrence of the term βάπτισμα. The same word, along with another still more significant, in the use of a similar metaphorical expression for the same idea, occurs in the answer to the sons of Zebedee; Can *ye* drink of the *cup*, which *I* am to drink? and be baptized with the *baptism*, with which *I* am baptized^c? The word βαπτίζεσθαι, in this figurative sense of persecution or suffering, endured for the sake of religion in general, or of any main article of religion in particular, seems to be so employed in that celebrated passage: ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται; τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν; τί καὶ ἡμεῖς κινδυνεύομεν πᾶσαν ὥραν^d; the context of which proves that βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν is κινδυνεύειν ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν—the fire of which baptism, the brunt of which danger, in vindication of one of the main articles of the Christian faith, the resurrection of the dead, falling principally on the champions of all those articles κατ' ἐξοχὴν, the Apostles, St. Paul naturally specifies them in general, or himself in particular, directly afterwards: τί καὶ ἡμεῖς κινδυνεύομεν πᾶσαν ὥραν; and, καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκω. κ. τ. λ. *

* This explanation of the phrase, I think, is strikingly illustrated by the following pas-

sage from the Acta Pionii, Acta Martyrum, 150. cap. 21.

Hæc me ducit causa, hæc me

^b John ii. 19. vi. 51—58. 70.

^c Matt. xx. 22. Mark x. 38.

^d 1 Cor. xv. 29, 30.

The parallel passage of St. Matthew being compared with that of St. Luke ^e,

Μὴ νομίσητε, ὅτι

ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. Πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν.

it follows that what our Lord did not come to cast upon the land, in the one, must be the ἀντίστοιχον of what he did come to cast upon the land, in the other: and if πῦρ be the latter and εἰρήνη the former, then πῦρ in the one must be the ἀντίστοιχον of εἰρήνη in the other; and *vice versa*. Now nothing can be the proper ἀντίστοι-

potissimum ratio compellit ad mortem, ut populus omnis intelligat resurrectionem futuram esse post mortem. The holy martyr was, at that very time, nailed down to his funeral pyre. Surely this, if any thing, might be called βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν: not to mention that martyrdom, under all circumstances, is described by the Fathers as a *baptism*; a baptism in and by the blood of the sufferer, if possible holier and better, than proper baptism itself, and where that was wanting, abundantly competent to supply its place. The proper meaning of the verb, is to *dip under water*, to *drown*, in the sense of being exposed to danger, distress, or suffering, beyond the ability of the patient to endure; in which sense βαπτίζεσθαι is of classical occurrence, used absolutely. Diodorus Sic. i. 73: τοὺς δὲ ιδιώτας, διὰ τὴν ἐκ τούτων εὐπορίαν, οὐ βαπτίζουσι ταῖς εἰσφοραῖς. Plutarch, De Liberis Educandis, Operum vi. 30: τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ψυχὴ τοῖς μὲν συμμέτροις αὖξεται πόνοις, τοῖς δ' ὑπερβάλλουσι βαπτίζεται. Maximus Tyrius, Dissertatio vi. 3: ὑφ' ὧν τὸ φιλεῖν,

ἐλαυνόμενον καὶ κατορυντόμενον καὶ βαπτιζόμενον, μόγῃς που σώζει ἀμαυρὰ ἔχνη καὶ ἀσθενῇ. Charito, Lib. ii. 28. l. 2: καίτοι γὰρ βαπτιζόμενος ὑπὸ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας, γενναῖος ἀνὴρ ἐπειράτο ἀντέχεσθαι. Primarily, the word applies to a ship foundering at sea. The Valentinians put a strange construction on the text: understanding by the person baptized ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, in each instance, the party's guardian angel. Vide Clemens Alex. Operum ii. 974. Excerpta Theodoti, xxii. In other instances, that vicarious baptism in behalf of catechumens, who died before they had been baptized, was literally practised by certain of the heretical sects of old, especially by the followers of Cerinthus and Marcion, is indisputably true. Vide Tertullian, i. 414. Contra Marcionem, v. 10: iii. 308. De Resurrectione Carnis, 48: Epiphanius, i. 114. B. Cerinthiani, vi: Ibid. 230. D. Marcionistæ: ii. 143. A. Anacephalæosis, ix: Theophylact, ii. 223. C. in 1 ad Cor. xv. or Chrysostom, Operum x. 378. B—E. in 1 ad Corinthios, Homilia xl. 1.

^e Matt. x. 34. Luke xii. 49.

χον of εἰρήνη, but πόλεμος; nor of πόλεμος but εἰρήνη: and consequently the signification of πῦρ, as so opposed, must be that of πόλεμος. Nor in fact can any metaphor, or interchange of ideas, be more natural than this, which personifies the idea of war by that of a fire or conflagration.

But this is not all: for if by εἰρήνη here must be meant the quiet and unmolested exercise of the Christian religion—a kind of peace in which none could have a proper interest except the professors of the religion themselves—then by the war, opposed to it, must be intended the turbulence and contrariety by which that quiet and unmolested exercise should be forcibly obstructed; a turbulence and contrariety beginning from the enemies of the religion, but spending their fury on its friends and advocates; a war which should originate in the bosom of private families, and ripen the seeds of discord in the lap of natural charities; a war which should spread from thence to the community at large, and operate to the dissolution of the social order; a war which the strong and violent should every where wage against the weak and unresisting; which, from the rapidity of its propagation, the universality of its operation, the searching nature of its effects, might well be compared to a fire, kindled perhaps by a spark, but finding materials at hand, soon blown up into a blaze, and wrapping eventually an entire country in the same conflagration.

Such a fire and such a war were the coming of Christ, and the propagation of the Gospel, to produce in the Jewish community. What shall we say then to the time of its beginning, and to the first subjects of its effects? Were this violence and this fire to be directed against the Master, or against the disciples first? Doubtless against the Master first, and against the dis-

ciples next. For they were to drink of *his* cup; that is, not until *he* had drunk of it before them: they were to be bathed in *his* fire; that is, not until *he* had been baptized therein himself. In all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, both as an example of patience and as a pattern of virtue. If so, and Christ must of necessity suffer before, it is true, but still in the same way in kind as his disciples; then the fiery ordeal, which hereafter awaited them, was first to be undergone by him. Yet the period of his sufferings, strictly so called, was a determinate period; as may be collected from that peculiar, but regular mode of designating it by which St. John especially speaks of it; his hour, his hour κατ' ἐξοχήν, and the power* of darkness; which hour we consequently perceive to be the time of his apprehension, trial, and passion; that is, the last act of his ministry upon earth. As this period drew nigh, the fire, though not yet kindled, was nearer and nearer the time of its birth; and when it was close at hand, it might be said to be already lighted up: and this is the very manner in which it is referred to here. Εἰ ἡδὲ ἀνήφθη, spoken of this fire, cannot imply less than that it was either then kindled, or shortly to be so. The end of our Lord's ministry therefore at this time was not far distant.

Let the whole passage, then, be rendered as perhaps it ought to be rendered; with a short paraphrase of each verse subjoined. I came to cast a fire on the land; the very purpose of my mission was to excite such a fire, and to endure its first effects myself: and if even now it is kindled, what would I desire?

* The power of darkness, that is, the *authority*, ἐξουσία, of darkness: a word always to be understood of that right to

do with, or dispose of things and persons, *pro libitu*, which absolute power and control over them necessarily imply.

if the purpose of my mission is so much nearer its attainment, why should I wish it otherwise? But I have a baptism to be baptized withal, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished! How anxious I am that it should soon be completed; how dearly do I wish it were over!

Compare with this the following from St. John^f, which refers to the same prospect of our Lord's sufferings, but only at a later period: Now is my soul troubled! and what would I say? (τί εἴπω;) Father, save me from this hour! yet, διὰ τοῦτο, for the sake of this hour, am I come unto it. Why, then, should I pray to be delivered from it? There is sufficient agreement not only in the general sentiment, but even in the particular phraseology of these two passages, to shew that each is the same kind of apostrophe, produced by the common sensibility, and by the emotion arising from the common sensibility, on two distinct but cognate occasions, of the near prospect of the same painful and disastrous event.

The part addressed to the multitude, which concludes the chapter, admits also of distribution into the substance of 54-56, and the substance of 57-59. The first of these contains a distinct allusion to the demand of a sign, that is, an extraordinary proof of the truth of our Saviour's character, preferred and declined in the eleventh chapter. If there were any doubt upon this point, it would be removed by a comparison with Matt. xvi. 1-4, where the demand of such a sign, characterised by its proper name as the sign from heaven, is found to be put and declined in terms almost the same; the account of which was probably omitted, at that time, in the corresponding part of St. Luke's Gospel, because he knew that something of the same kind

^f Ch. xii. 27.

would occur again here. Ὁψίας γενομένης, λέγετε· εὐδία (ἔσται) πυρρᾶζει γὰρ ὁ οὐρανός· καὶ πρῶτ' σήμερον χειμών· πυρρᾶζει γὰρ στυγνάζων ὁ οὐρανός. ὑποκριταί, τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γινώσκετε διακρίνειν, τὰ δὲ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν οὐ δύνασθε;

In both these instances, the nature of the reasoning employed is to proceed upon the acknowledged observation of certain natural phenomena as indicating certain natural effects, the connection between which was obvious to every one; and as a case in point, they constitute the principles of a *reductio ad absurdum*, with a view to shew that it was mere hypocrisy on the part of the inquirers to be able thus to judge of the signs of the weather, or to draw the proper inference from the affections of the heavens, and yet mistake the signs of the times; not to draw the proper inference from the events which were daily passing before their eyes.

That the demand then of an extraordinary means of conviction, distinct from the ordinary or from the evidence daily produced, may be equally referred to in both these instances, must be apparent. There is some difference, however, in the later, compared with the earlier, which convinces me that more is intended by that, than was by this. It is not without reason that St. Matthew's general designation of σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν διακρίνειν is changed in St. Luke, for the particular one of τὸν δὲ καιρὸν τοῦτον πῶς οὐ δοκιμάζετε; The truth is that our Lord in St. Matthew was reproaching his hearers with not discerning, in the proofs of his Divine commission daily vouchsafed before, the time or season of the Messiah in general; in St. Luke, with not discovering, from the same proofs, as now vouchsafed, the last time or season of the Messiah in particular. The illustrations, which he employs, will lead to no other conclusion.

It is a well known fact with respect to Judæa, that the seasons of rain, and of fair weather, in that country were fixed and determinate: each had its proper commencement, and each its proper termination; and there was a definite interval between them. No allusion occurs in the sacred writers except to two such periods of rain; at opposite quarters of the year, and called respectively the former and the latter rain. From the passage of Joel, quoted below ^g, which is to this effect, He will cause to come down for you the rain, the former rain, and the *latter* rain, in the *first* month—it appears that the latter rain was that which fell in the spring, in or about the first month of the sacred year, Abib or Nisan, answering partly to April and partly to March with us. The same thing is implied by Jerome in his commentary upon Amos ^h: Quæ locusta venit in principio imbris serotini, quando cuncta virent et parturit omnis ager, et diversarum arborum flores in sui generis poma rumpuntur: for this is a description of the month Adar among the Jews. This, then, is the rain alluded to by Solomon ⁱ; For lo! the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land. The fig-tree putteth forth her green figs, and the vines with the tender grapes give a good smell. Amos iv. 7, it is said, And also I have withholden the rain from you, when there were yet *three* months to the harvest; which harvest being necessarily the wheat harvest, the season whereof was Pentecost, the period of the rain, three months prior to that, is at least the close of the last, or the beginning of the first month in

^g Lev. xxvi. 4. Deut. xi. 14. xxviii. 12. Job xxix. 23. Prov. xvi. 15. Jerem. iii. 3. v. 24. Hos. vi. 3. Joel ii. 23. Zech. x. 1. James v. 7. ^h Operum iii. 1432. *ad principium*. ⁱ Canticles ii. 11—13.

the sacred year. Jerome's commentary *in locum* is to this effect, Significat autem vernum tempus extremi mensis Aprilis, a quo usque ad messem frumenti, tres menses supersunt; Maius, Junius, Juliusⁱ; which, however, is not altogether a correct statement; for wheat harvest in Judæa, no more than in Egypt, was ever later than the beginning of June*. Now as the period of barley-

* Δυομένης πλειάδος is specified by Josephus^k as the beginning of one of the rainy seasons; which may be shewn from the context to be that of the vernal or latter rain as such.

I am well aware indeed that the notes of time, δυομένης πλειάδος, περὶ πλειάδων δύσιν, and the like, in their ordinary acceptation imply just the reverse of this; the commencement of the autumnal, not the end of the brumal quarter. But that Josephus intended to describe the period of the vernal rains, whether he has described it by its proper characteristics or not, appears from the fact that this supply of water from heaven was early in the duration of the siege alluded to, and long prior to the feast of Tabernacles. Now the feast of Tabernacles could never be later than the period ordinarily meant by the πλειάδων δύσιν; which the ancient Calendar^l placed about forty-three or forty-four days after the autumnal equinox, as they did their rising about the same time after the vernal. Forty-four days after the autumnal equinox bring us to the seventh of November; almost a month later than the latest time when the feast of Tabernacles could fall. The necessity of the case

then requires that Josephus should be understood of the πλειάδων ἐπιτολή, not the δύσιν: the time of which would be early in May, not much posterior to the ordinary termination of the vernal rains.

There is a passage in Æschylus which, as implying a similar inaccuracy, admits of comparison with this of Josephus. Speaking of the capture of Troy, he describes the ἵππου νεοσσός, *equus durateus*, as πῆδη' ὀρούσας ἀμφὶ πλειάδων δύσιν. Agamemnon, 835: whereas the uniform historical tradition is that Troy was taken in the Attic month Thargelion, Scirophorion, or the like. Nec referam Scæas, et Pergama Apollinis artes, | Et Danaum undecimo vere redisse rates. Propertius, iii. ix. 39. Yet Eusebius (Chronicon Arm. Lat. i. 367) though quoting professedly from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, represents him as saying that Troy was taken *estate vergente, xvii. diebus ante hibernum solstitium*. Syncellus i. 324. l. 15. has the same statement. Dionysius (Ant. Rom. i. 63,) really says, seventeen days before the summer solstice. Cf. Plutarch, Camillus, 19: Clemens Alex. i. 381. l. 9—19: Strom. i. 21.

ⁱ Operum iii. 1401. *ad principium*.
H. N. xviii. 59. ii. 47. xi. 15. xvii. 30. §. 2.

^k Ant. Jud. xiii. viii. 2.

^l Pliny,

harvest coincided with the anniversary of the Pass-over, and the effect of the latter rains, as indeed of the rainy season in general, when over, was necessarily to swell the Jordan; hence it is stated in the book of Joshua^m, Jordan overfloweth all his banks, all the time of harvest, that is of barley-harvest^{*}; for the river was crossed on the tenth of Nisanⁿ. By the time of barley-harvest, that is, before the middle of Nisan, which in a rectified year answered to the middle of April, the vernal rains would almost always be over: and sometimes by the middle of March. There is a case in point, mentioned by Josephus, when the Jordan was impassable on account of the rain, on or about the fourth of Dystrus; which corresponded in that year to February 25.^o

After the cessation of the last or the spring rains, the continuance of fine weather until the periodic recurrence of the first or the autumnal rains; that is, all through the vernal and summer quarters; is equally well attested. Σπάνιον δὲ, εἴ ποτε, τὸ κλίμα τοῦτο θέρους ὕεται^p. Nunquam enim in fine mensis Junii, sive in mense Julio, in his provinciis, maximeque in Judæa, pluvias vidimus^q. Hence, at the inauguration of Saul, which 1 Sam. xii. 17 proves to have taken place about the feast of Pentecost, or in the ἀκμὴ of wheat-harvest, thunder and rain were so strange a phenomenon, as justly to be appealed to in token of the displeasure of God.

Nor is this all. The interval between the latter and the former rains seems to have been in general the interval between the autumnal and the vernal equinox;

* So likewise is it said to do Josephum, vol. ii. (Havercam- by the Pseudo-Aristeas, apud pii.)

^m Ch. iii. 15.

^o Bell. Jud. iv. vii. 3. 5.

Ant. xviii. viii. 6.

ⁿ Ch. iv. 19. Vide also 1 Chron. xii. 15. Jerem. xii. 5.

^p Bell. Jud. iii. vii. 12. Vide also

^q Hieronymus, Operum iii. 1401. *ad principium.*

that is, about six months. The one were over about the Passover, and the other set in shortly after the Scenopegia^r. The duration of the dearth in the time of Elijah, though not specified in the Old Testament, further than as almost three years, is twice specified in the New^s, and each time as a dearth of three years and six months in length; which is to be accounted for in this manner. The strictly preternatural period of the drought both began and terminated, as was to be expected, with the ordinary season of the first rain; that is, the autumnal quarter of the year: and lasted just three years in all. The six months, in addition to that, were, consequently, the ordinary interval between the latter and the former rain: which, though they did certainly aggravate the whole duration, and the consequent effects of the drought, could not by themselves be considered unnatural or extraordinary.

That this explanation is correct appears from Josephus^t; who cites Menander, the Tyrian historian, in testimony to a drought in the reign of Ithobal, the Ethbaal of Scripture and father of Jezebel; which extended from Hyperberetæus or Tisri in one year, to the same month in the next. And hence we may better appreciate the maternal piety of Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah, and concubine of Saul, which is instanced, 2 Sam. xxi. 9, 10. For these seven men were put to death in the first days of barley-harvest, that is, so early as the sixteenth of Nisan; and her watching over their bodies, which lasted until water dropped upon them out of heaven, must have continued past the same time in the month of Tisri. The Mishna places the recurrence of the autumnal rains, one year with another, about the end of the first

^r Cf. Ezra x. 9—13.
xiii. 2.

^s Luke iv. 25. James v. 17.

^t Ant. Jud. viii.

week in Marchesvan; a fortnight after the close of the feast of Tabernacles *^u.

Now the natural phenomena, mentioned by our Saviour, are referred to as indicating not merely certain natural consequences in general, but certain stated and regular consequences in particular. *Γίνεται οὕτω*, or *καὶ γίνεται*, is subjoined to each. The natural effects, supposed to be of this regular kind, are these two, *rain* and *καύσων*; which may well be understood of dry, and hot or sultry weather. The appearance, which indicated the former, was the rising of the cloud from the west; as that, which prognosticated the latter, was the beginning of the south wind to blow.

Now the very terms, in which the first of these symptoms is alluded to—*ὅταν ἴδῃτε τὴν νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν ἀπὸ δυσμῶν*—authorize the following conclusions respecting it. First, it was some well known and remarkable cloud; secondly, it was never observed in any quarter but the west: and we have seen that it was the harbinger of rain. The west in Judæa is the region of the Mediterranean sea; this cloud from the west, therefore, was necessarily a cloud from that sea. The cloud itself, the quarter where it first appeared, and

* The result of Mr. Harmer's observations on this subject in general is, that rain might fall in Judæa so early as the end of September; but that the rainy season as such could not be said to be set in before the beginning of November.

Josephus supplies a case in point when it appears to have so begun^v. The remarkable storm of rain and wind, which is there described, being not

many days later than the arrival of John of Gischala at Jerusalem, nor that arrival than the end of the month Tisri, must have coincided with about the middle of Marchesvan; and have been consequently the setting in of the autumnal rains. See also a similar instance in Diodorus Siculus^w, of a storm encountered *περὶ πλειάδος δύσιν*, when Demetrius Poliorcetes was sailing with a fleet to invade Egypt.

^u ii. 357. 3.

^v Bell. Jud. iv. iv. 5.

^w xx. 74.

the effect by which it was followed, are all satisfactorily illustrated by a parallel instance, at the end of the great drought before alluded to ^x. This cloud (ἡ νεφέλη) was that cloud, in the shape of a man's hand, which the servant of Elijah, at his seventh errand, saw and reported to be rising from the sea: after which, in a very short time, and almost before Ahab could prepare his chariot for departing, The heaven was black with clouds and wind, and there was a great rain. It is reasonable to presume that this was a familiar phenomenon in Judæa; the natural effect of a long continuance of dry and sultry weather; and the natural prognostic also of its speedy termination, by the setting in of the autumnal rains ^{*}.

With regard to the other phenomenon; the south, in reference to Judæa, is the region of the sandy desert of Idumæa and of Arabia; that is, it is the region of barrenness, heat, and thirst: a wind from that quarter, therefore, would naturally be the forerunner of sultry weather. Concerning the south winds in that quarter, Diodorus writes thus: θερμοὶ γίνονται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν, ὥστε καὶ τὰς ὕλας ἐκπυροῦν, καὶ τῶν καταφενγόντων εἰς τὰς ἐν ταῖς καλύβαις σκιὰς ἐκλύειν τὰ σώματα ^y: Seneca; Austro quoque, qui ex illo tractu venit, ventorum calidissimus est ^z: Pliny; Austros ibi tam ardentes flare, ut æstatibus sylvas accendant, invenimus apud auctores ^a: Philo Judæus; ξηρός τε γὰρ ἐστὶ, καὶ κεφαλαλγῆς, καὶ βαρνήκοος, ἄσας τε καὶ ἀδημονίας ἐμποιεῖν ἱκανός, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, κειμένα κατὰ τὰ νότια, δι' ὧν αἱ περιπολήσεις τῶν φωσφόρων ἀστέρων, ὡς ἅμα τῷ διακινήθηναι, τὸν ἀπ' ἡλίου φλογμὸν συνεπωθεῖσθαι, καὶ πάντα καίειν ^b.

* According to Mr. Harmer the prognostic of the same natural event still.

^x 1 Kings xviii. 41—end. ^y Diodorus Sic. iii. 47. Vide also Herodotus, ii. 22. ^z Naturalium Quæst. iv. 2. §. 18. ^a H. N. xii. 42. ^b Operum ii. 99. l. 37—43. De Mose. Vide also Aristotle, Meteorologica, ii. 3. 5.

But this is not all. A variety of notices, relating to the south wind, may be specified from ancient authors; which, as it appears to me, are applicable to the case in point.

I. The year being taken throughout, the prevailing winds, almost every where, are described as the north and the south. Πλείστοι γὰρ βορέαι καὶ νότοι γίγνονται τῶν ἀνέμων ^c—Πλείστων δὲ ὄντων, ὥσπερ εἴρηται, βορείων καὶ νοτίων ^d.

II. The south wind, in southern regions, was a fair wind; and hence one of its names, and perhaps the most appropriate, was that of Λευκόνοτος. Ἀργέστην δὲ νότον, τὸν λευκόνοτον· οὗτος γὰρ ὀλίγα τὰ νέφη ποιεῖ ^e—Ἐνιοι τὸν νότον οἶονται διὰ παντὸς ὑγρὸν εἶναι· τὸ δ' οὐχ οὕτως ἔχει· φαίνεται γὰρ ἐνίοτε ξηρὸς γινόμενος· ὃν καὶ προσαγορεύουσιν οἱ ἰδιῶται λευκόνοτον ^f—Permutant et duo naturam cum situ. Auster Africæ serenus, Aquilo nubilus ^g—Ὁ μὲν γὰρ νότος ἀεὶ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ τόποις αἰθριος ^h—Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ νότος αἰθριος τοῖς περὶ τὴν Λιβύην ⁱ—Καὶ γὰρ τὸν νότον παρ' ἡμῖν μὲν εἶναι χειμέριον, περὶ δὲ τὴν Αἰθιοπίαν αἰθριον ὑπάρχειν ^k.

ALBUS ut obscuro deterget nubila cælo

Sæpe NOTUS, neque parturit imbres

Perpetuos——

Horace, Carminum i. vii. 15.

Quare ne tibi sit tanti Sidonia vestis,

Ut timeas, quoties nubilus Auster erit,

Propertius, ii. xvi. 55.

III. The south wind was an etesian or monsoon, as well as the northern. Both Pliny and Diodorus¹ attest that the etesian winds were not confined to the northern quarter of the heavens. Ὅθεν καὶ τὸ θαυμα-

^c Aristotle, Meteorologica, ii. 4.
^d Theophrastus, De Ventis, 404. *ad medium*.

^e Strabo, i. 78.

^f Galen, Operum ix. 258. B.

^g Pliny,

H. N. ii. 48.

^h Theophrastus, De Ventis, 403. *ad medium*.

ⁱ Aristotle,

Meteorologica, ii. 3.

^k Diodorus Siculus, i. 41.

¹ Pliny, H. N. ii. 48.

Diodorus, i. 39.

ζόμενον ὡς οὐκ ὄν, διατὶ βορέαι μὲν ἐτησίαι γίνονται, νότοι δὲ οὐ γίνονται, φαίνεται πῶς συμβαίνειν^k—Etesiae et prodromi...qui certo tempore anni, cum Canis oritur, ex alia atque alia parte coeli spirant—P. Nigidii in secundo librorum, quos de vento composuit, verba haec sunt; Etesiae et Austri anniversarii, secundo sole, flant^l.

IV. The northern monsoons were in general the summer wind; and the southern the winter. Hence Lucretius, in his beautiful picture of the seasons :

It Ver, et Venus ; et Veris prænuncius ante
Pennatus graditur Zephyrus, vestigia propter
Flora quibus mater, præspargens ante viâ
Cuncta, coloribus egregiis et odoribus obplet.
Inde loci sequitur Calor aridus, et comes una
Pulverulenta Ceres, et Etesia flabra Aquilonum.
Inde Auctumnus adit, graditur simul Euius Euan :
Inde aliæ Tempestates, Venteique, sequuntur ;
Altitonans Voltumnus, et Auster fulmine pollens.
Tandem Bruma niveis adfert, pigrumque rigorem
Reddit ; Hyems sequitur, crepitans ac dentibus Algu.

v. 736.

Hence also his description of the equinoctial points themselves :

Nam medio cursu flatûs Aquilonis et Austri,
Distinet æquato cælum discrimine metas. Ib. 688.

Ἀποροῦσι δέ τινες διὰ τί βορέαι μὲν γίνονται συνεχεῖς, οὓς καλούμεν ἐτησίας, μετὰ τὰς θερινὰς τροπὰς, νότοι δ' οὕτως οὐ γίνονται μετὰ τὰς χειμερινάς. ἔχει δὲ οὐκ ἀλόγως γίνονται μὲν γὰρ οἱ καλούμενοι λευκόνοτοι τὴν ἀντικειμένην ὥραν (τοῖς βορείοις)^m. Quia flatibus *Etesiarum* implentur vada (Caspî sc. maris); *hibernus* Auster revolvit fluctusⁿ. "Ὅτε ὁ ἥλιός ἐστιν ἐν Αἰγυπτῷ, τῷ Τυβὶ μηνί, ὅς ἐστι κατὰ Ῥωμαίους Ἰανουάριος, ὅτε καὶ ὁ νότος ἐν χειμῶνι πνεῖⁿⁿ.

^k Theophrastus, De Ventis, 404. *ad calcem*.

^l Aulus Gellius, ii. 22.

^m Aristotle, Meteorologica, ii. 5.

ⁿ Tacitus, Ann. vi. 33.

ⁿⁿ Scholia

ad Arati Phænomena, 408.

V. The southern wind, among its other times, blew most regularly at the close of the brumal quarter, and the beginning of the vernal. Columella, *De Re Rustica*; xvii. Kalend. Febr...Africus, interdum Auster, cum pluvia—v. Kalend. Febr. Auster, aut Africus, hiematⁿ—Sex diebus ante Maias idus; quod tempus austrinum est^o. Ἐκατέρων οἶον τάξις, ἐν οἷς χρόνοις μάλιστα πνέουσι, κατὰ λόγον ἐστί· τοῖς μὲν βορείοις, χειμῶνός τε, καὶ θέρους, καὶ μετοπώρου . . . τοῖς δὲ νοτίοις, κατὰ χειμῶνά τε, καὶ ἀρχομένου ἔαρος, καὶ μετοπώρου ληγόντος—οἱ γὰρ ἡρινοὶ νότοι καθάπερ ἐτησῖαι τινές εἰσιν· οὓς καλοῦσι λευκονότους· αἰθριοὶ γὰρ, καὶ ἀσυννεφεῖς, ὡς ἐπίπαν—τὸν βορέαν ἐπιπνεῖν τῷ νότῳ, τὸν δὲ νότον μὴ τῷ βορέᾳ^p—Ζῶσι δ' ἀπὸ ἀκρίδων, ἃς οἱ ἔαρινοὶ λίβες καὶ ζέφυροι, πνέοντες μεγάλοι, συνελαύνουσιν εἰς τοὺς τόπους τούτους—Ὑπὸ δὲ τὴν ἔαρινὴν ἰσημερίαν, ὅτε λίβες παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ζέφυροι πνέουσι, παμμεγεθὼν ἀκρίδων πλῆθος ἀμύθητον...μετὰ τῶν ἀνέμων παραγίνεται—Κατὰ γὰρ τὴν ἔαρινὴν ὥραν παρ' αὐτοῖς ζέφυροι καὶ λίβες παμμεγέθεις ἐκρίπτουσιν ἐκ τῆς ἐρήμου πλῆθος ἀκρίδων ἀμύθητον^q. This wind, from its bringing the birds of passage, Aristotle and Pliny call ornithian, or chelidonian: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὰς χειμερινὰς τροπὰς πνέουσιν οἱ ὀρνιθῖαι· καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι ἐτησῖαι εἰσὶν ἀσθενεῖς· ἐλάττους δὲ καὶ ὀψιαίτεροι τῶν ἐτησίων πνέουσιν· ἐβδομηκοστῇ γὰρ (which is dated from the τροπαὶ χειμεριναί, or winter solstice) ἄρχονται πνεῖν^r. Spirant autem et a bruma, cum vocantur Ornithiæ; sed leniores, et paucis diebus—Favonium quidam ad VIII. Kalendas Martii Chelidoniam vocant, ab hirundinis visu; nonnulli vero Ornithian, uno et LXX. die post brumam, ab adventu avium, flantem per dies novem *^s.

* Harduin reads here in Pliny but Pliny took the statement uno et LX. die post brumam: from Aristotle, who speaks of

ⁿ Lib. xi. 2. ^o Pliny, H. N. ii. 47. ^p Theophrastus, *De Ventis*, 404. *ad principium et ad calcem*. ^q Strabo, xvi. 4. §. 12. 411. Agatharchides, *apud Geographos Veteres*, i. 42. Diodorus Sic. iii. 28.

^r Aristotle, *ut supra*.
^s Pliny, H. N. ii. 48. 47.

Accordingly Josephus speaks of the south wind as blowing in a given instance, at the time of the recapture of Masada^t, on the fifteenth of Xanthicus, Tuesday, April 11, U. C. 826; and Solomon, Canticles iv. 16, alludes to both the north and the south as winds peculiar to the vernal quarter, and wont to succeed each other; Awake O north wind! and come thou south! blow upon my garden, that the spices thereof may flow out. Moreover, the Indian caravans, which set out upon their return to Egypt between the end of December and the middle of January in every year, upon entering the Red sea, which they did after forty days' voyage, are said to have finished the rest of the journey, which took up thirty days' more^u, *africo vel austro*; each of them a monsoon, or trade wind. On this principle those winds must have begun and continued to blow, in the Red sea, contiguous to Judæa, seventy days after the beginning of January; that is, until as late as the first or second week in March: which would be the beginning of the dry season in that country*.

the seventieth day after the winter solstice.

* According to Mr. Harmer, both Pococke and Maillet attest that the people in Egypt scarcely eat any thing, during the months of April and May, but fish and vegetables; the great heats taking away their appetite for any sort of flesh meat. (Vol. ii. 327. Ch. ix. Obs. xii.)

The cause of these heats, according to Maillet, is the blowing of the south wind; which sets in in April. (See p. 445.) Cf. vol. iv. 295. 299. chap. ix.

Obs. clxxix. and 316. Obs. clxxxiii.

Mr. Harmer (p. 327, 328) explains the murmuring of the Israelites, Numbers xi. 4, 5, and their pining for the fish and fruits of Egypt, on this principle. Numbers x. 11. 33, this would be in May or June.

If such winds commonly set in in Egypt in the spring quarter of the year, they could scarcely fail to affect Judæa in a similar manner. And this is a remarkable coincidence not only in illustration of the pre-

^t Bell. Jud. vii. viii. 5. ix. 1. Solinus, Polyhistor, liv. §. 9, 10.

^u Pliny, H. N. vi. 26. Vide also

Laying these testimonies together, we may fairly come to the conclusion that the south wind's commencing to blow was a natural indication of the approach of the dry, and therefore of the close of the rainy, season in Judæa: as the appearance of the cloud was of the reverse. If so, our Lord intended to reproach his hearers with not being able from the signs of the times, as a case in point, to discover that this was the last and concluding period of his ministry. For there was truly something, and there had been for some time past, in his manner and demeanour, which might have warranted this presumption. His diligence, activity, and earnestness ever since the last feast of Tabernacles, up to the present circuit, were sufficient to have raised the reflection that his time was at hand; that the exigency of the occasion was pressing; that the intermediate period was short, and no part of it was to be idly or unprofitably spent. He delivered more discourses, he spake more parables, he wrought more miracles, and perhaps he visited more places, within the last three months of his ministry, than ever within an equal time before. St. Luke's Gospel, which in less than nine chapters comprised the account of two years and nine months previously, is taken up, for more than fourteen chapters, with the history of these two or three months alone subsequently. Within this period, too, the Seventy had been sent out; that is, the service, before rendered by the Twelve, was increased sixfold by this second mission: and our Lord himself was now following in their

sent subject, but also as casting light upon that scene on the lake of Galilee, related John xxi, the time of which was either April or early in May.

The existence of hot winds

in Judæa in the spring, is further implied by the allusions to the *heat* in harvest; sometimes such as to be fatal. See Prov. x. 5, according to the *o'*. 2 Kings iv. 18—20. Judith viii. 3.

track, and visiting personally either all or most of the places which had been recently evangelized by them.

The same conclusion, respecting the nature of the present time, is suggested also by the last member of the division, beginning, And why, even of yourselves, do ye not judge of that is just? The reasoning, immediately subjoined, supposes two parties; a creditor who is reclaiming, and a debtor who is withholding, the same *just* debt. It supposes that the creditor, after trying every other expedient in vain, is having recourse to the law, and bringing his debtor before the judge*: it supposes that the two parties are actually on the way to the court of justice; but not yet arrived there. It supposes, consequently, a remaining interval, but a short and finite one; within which it is still possible for the refractory party to make up the matter, by satisfying the debt of his own accord; and so stopping all further proceedings. But it supposes that, if he persists in his obstinacy to the last, and the case comes before the judge, there will be no longer the means of retreat; the law must take its usual course: the judge will deliver him to the exactor; the exactor will consign him to prison; and he will never come out from thence until he have repaid the uttermost farthing.

* The Roman law allowed the plaintiff (especially in cases of debt) to deal in this summary manner with the defendant. Valerius Maximus, ii. i. 5: Sed quo matronale decus verecundiæ munimento tutius esset, in jus vocanti matronam *corpus* ejus *attingere* non permiserunt: which of course must have been allowable with the persons of the other sex.

Hence, Horace, Sermonum i. ix. 77. Rapit in jus: clamor

utrinque: | Undique concursus. And ii. iii. 72. Cum rapies in jus malis ridentem alienis. Juvenal, x. 87. Et pavidum in jus | Cervice obstricta dominum trahat. Ibid. xiii. 108. Trahere immo ultro ac vexare paratus.

Plinius, Panegyricus, 36. §. 3: Dicitur actori atque etiam procuratori tuo: *In jus veni: sequere ad tribunal.* Arrian in Epictetum, i. cap. 29. 154: ἀλλ' εἰληπταί μοῦ τις τοῦ ἱματίου, καὶ ἔλκει με εἰς τὴν ἀγοράν κ', τ. λ.

Now, all this was applicable to the case of our Lord, and of the Jewish people ; the former of whom, upon the strength of sufficient evidence, had long been claiming to be received as their Messiah, and the latter, notwithstanding this evidence, had long been refusing to receive him as such. But it was applicable only on the further supposition that, at this present time, our Lord was making a last and a final appeal to the same people, with a view to their conversion ; that the period both of his own ministry, and of their probation, was fast drawing to its close : beyond which should the national impenitence be protracted, they must expect to be given up to the penal consequences of an obstinate unbelief. This part, therefore, leads to the same conclusion as the rest of the chapter before it.

DISSERTATION XXXV.

On the incident relating to the Galileans, Luke xiii. 1-9.

THE connection of this section with the preceding chapter, which would otherwise be the first thing to require pointing out, has been demonstrated already. The phrase ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ, as equivalent to ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ καιρῷ, at the *self-same* season, instead of at *the same* season, is among the peculiar idioms of St. Luke ^a; and by its occurrence here ascertains the time of the following account to be directly consecutive upon the preceding. This allusion, then, to the fate of the Galileans took place soon after the previous discourse; and the matter of fact alluded to, if we proceed to examine it, will perhaps be found to conspire with that discourse itself, in leading to the same conclusion, which the consideration of the discourse enabled us to deduce in the preceding Dissertation.

With a view to this examination I am not aware that it makes much difference whether we suppose the Galileans in question to be some of the sect, who are known in contemporary history by their relation to Judas, surnamed the Galilean; or certain of the people of Galilee. The same conclusions would follow in either case; yet the latter, and not the former, is indisputably the more correct opinion.

For first, when a word possesses both a *general* and *proper*, and also a *particular* and *improper* signification, like this of the Galileans, it is scarcely possible that it should be used ἀπλῶς, as it is here, except in the for-

^a Ch. vii. 21. x. 21. xii. 12. xiii. 31. xx. 19. xxiii. 12. xxiv. 13. 33.

mer. Those, for whom St. Luke was writing, might very well comprehend what was meant by the people of Galilee; but could not, without some further explanation, understand what was intended by the followers of Judas of Galilee.

Secondly, the name of Galileans, as descriptive of any such sect, occurs no where in the Gospels: the principles of the sect may often be alluded to, but the name of it is regularly kept out of sight. St. Luke in particular suppresses even the name of the Herodians, which neither St. Matthew nor St. Mark does; though the principles of that sect, as the second of the passages cited below serves to demonstrate^b, if they were not the same with the principles of the Galileans, bordered very closely upon them.

The truth is, the denomination of Galileans was never the peculiar name of their sect: it may be given, indeed, to their founder, as at Acts v. 37, in reference either to his supposed country, or to the persons of whom his followers, at the time, principally consisted; but as a specific designation for his party, it is as little to be met with in Josephus as in the Gospels. Judas himself was a Gaulanite, ἐκ πόλεως ὀνομα Γάμυλα *^c: though he may also be called the Galilean; and if his party had any distinctive appellation, it was that of the Zealots or Sicarii. As such they are enumerated by Josephus, in their proper place, among the other sects of the Jews^d. But even the Zealots were a

* Golan in Bashan, mentioned Joshua xx. 8, gave name in after time to the district of Gaulanitis, or Batanea, of Josephus.

For the site of Gamala in lower Gaulanitis, see Josephus, De Bello, iv. i. 1.

^b Luke vi. 11. xx. 20. viii. 1. xvii. 8.

^c Ant. xviii. i. 1. Cf. ibid. 6. xx. v. 2. Bell. ii. 1—6. Bell. ii. viii. 1—14. vii. viii. 1.

branch of the Pharisees : and their founder was Zadok the Pharisee, as much as Judas the Galilean.

Thirdly, it may very well be questioned whether, after the rise and dispersion of the party, U. C. 760, until near the time of the Jewish war, when it again started into being, the sect of the Zealots existed except in abeyance. The attempt of Judas was speedily followed by his death; and the reasoning of Gamaliel in the Acts necessarily supposes that both he and his followers had come to nothing. Had not this been notoriously the fact, his very example, as a case in point, would have made against him. At the time of our Saviour's trial before Pilate^e, he was plainly charged with maintaining the principles of Judas; but he was not himself called either a Zealot or a Galilean. In Josephus too, though certain of the sons or descendants of Judas may be alluded to at intermediate periods, and on distinct occasions^f, yet no overt act similar to the first insurrection, U. C. 760, in which any of his party or his family were concerned, can be found on record, prior to U. C. 819, when Manahem, a descendant of his, it is true, seized upon Masada^g, and usurped the tyranny of his countrymen, at the outset of the Jewish war.

It was not, in fact, possible that in peaceful and quiet times such a sect could be tolerated for a moment. Their principles led directly to anarchy and insubordination. It was a point of conscience with them to disclaim the authority of the Roman emperor, or of his procurators; to withhold the payment of tribute; to resist, in short, the imposition of any foreign yoke, and to acknowledge no master but God. From the time, therefore, of the census of Quirinius and of

^e Luke xxiii. 2.

^f Ant. xx. v. 2. Bell. vii. viii. 1.

^g Bell. ii. xvii. 8.

the mission of Coponius, the civil constitution of Judæa and this sect could not both subsist together ; their principles on the one hand allowed of no compromise between liberty or death ; the stability of the existing government on the other, none between its own entire ascendancy and their utter annihilation. If the Galileans had survived the first contest, the Roman yoke must have been for ever shaken off : if the Roman government triumphed, the Galileans must have perished in the struggle.

Fourthly, it is probable, from xiii. 31, that Jesus was at this very time in Galilee ; and it is certain that he must have been somewhere in the dominions of Herod. This circumstance might account for the communication, xiii. 1 itself ; but it supposes that the sufferers alluded to were inhabitants of Galilee. For where would a misfortune, which had happened to Galileans in particular, be so likely to excite an interest as in Galilee ? and about whom were the people of Galilee so likely to feel an interest, as about their own countrymen ?

Fifthly, the reasoning, which our Lord grounds upon the communication made to him, must be decisive whom it refers to. He opposes these Galileans, who had perished, as a *part*, to the Galileans, who still survived, as a *whole* ; and he urges the fact of what had befallen the *part*, as a warning of what might be expected by the *whole*. There can be no doubt that, in the latter instance, he means the people of Galilee ; for he identifies them with his hearers at the time : and consequently there can be as little that he meant them also in the former. In like manner, directly after ^h, he opposes a certain number of the inhabitants of Jerusalem to the rest of the people of the same city ; and from the fact

^h Ch. xiii. 4.

of what had befallen the former, he derives the same inference of what, unless they repented, might be expected by the latter. In each instance, a part is opposed to a whole ; a less number to a greater ; but each as of the same kind and both as included within the same complex. We may take it for granted therefore that the persons alluded to here were no partisans of Judas of Galilee ; but strictly and properly Galileans.

Again, it seems equally reasonable to conclude that, whatever had befallen them in general, it was something which had befallen them *recently*. An event like this would naturally be talked about only as soon as it happened ; and those who apprised our Saviour of it *now*, it is manifest, could not suppose that he was aware of it already. His own language is in favour of this conclusion : Think ye, that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, that they *have suffered* such things ? When he is referring to a fact, of unquestionably more ancient date, his language is perceptibly different : Or they, the eighteen, on whom the tower in Siloam *fell*,* and *slew* them, think ye that these were offenders, above all that were dwelling at Jerusalem ?

Again, whatever had befallen them in particular, it was something which had befallen them innocently ; that is, they had not brought it upon themselves. The very construction, put upon their misfortune, seems to be a proof of this. If they had been anywise instrumental to it, it would not have been accidental ; and if it had not been accidental, it could not have been construed

* That the pool of Siloah was close to the walls of Jerusalem appears from Nehemiah iii. 15 : the first instance of the mention

of this pool, historically, which occurs in the Old Testament : though Isaiah refers to its waters, viii. 6.

into a judgment for sin. These men must have perished at a time, and in a manner, which humanly speaking would acquit them of all blame, as having drawn down their own death; and would resolve it solely into the controlling providence of God.

Again, there is no proof in contemporary history of any disturbance in Jerusalem, the scene of which was not principally, if not exclusively, the temple; and the time of which was not, still more invariably, about the period of some feast. *Μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν ταῖς εὐωχίαις αὐτῶν στάσις ἄπτεται*ⁱ. Such disturbances always took place when the Jews were assembled in greater numbers than usual: and they were never so assembled, except before and during the feasts^k. Now the scene of the outrage upon these Galileans was manifestly the temple; for the outrage occurred in the midst of sacrifice; either of *their* sacrifices, or of the sacrifices *themselves*, according as we choose to render *τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν*. And if Pilate also was present at Jerusalem, the time when it happened was the time of some feast. Cæsarea, and not Jerusalem, was the seat of the civil government^l; so that he would never be ordinarily resident at Jerusalem, except during the periods of the feasts; when, for the same reason that a guard was always kept stationed in Antonia, (*ἐνοπλοὶ δὲ ἀεὶ τὰς ἑορτὰς παραφυλάττουσιν, ὥς μή τι νεωτερίζοι τὸ πλῆθος συνηθροισμένον*^m, that is, because the risk of extraordinary danger required extraordinary precaution to prevent it,) the supreme magistrate also took care to be on the spot.

Again, the case of Barabbas, as specified in each of

ⁱ Bell. Jud. i. iv. 3. ^k Ant. xvii. ix. 3. x. 2. Bell. ii. i. 3. iii. 1. Ant. xviii. ii. 2. xx. v. 3. Bell. ii. xii. 1. ^l Tacitus, Hist. ii. 79. Acts xxiii. 23—end. xxv. 1—6. 13. Ant. Jud. xviii. iii. 1. iv. 3. Bell. ii. ix. 2. 4. Ant. xx. v. 4. viii. 7. Bell. ii. xii. 2. 5. xiii. 7. xiv. 4. 6. ^m Bell. ii. xii. 1. Ant. xx. v. 3. Vide also Bell. v. v. 8.

the Gospels, is a proof that, before the last Passover, there had been a tumult in the city, accompanied by bloodshed ⁿ: for he was still in prison, on that account, at the time of our Saviour's condemnation: and the same case is equally a proof that the tumult itself was a recent occurrence; for though both he and his accomplices had been imprisoned, none of them had yet been executed, on that account. The bloodshed which had accompanied this disturbance, it is reasonable to suppose was the bloodshed of Roman soldiers, not of native Jews; in which case, nothing was more likely to have provoked the retaliatory vengeance of the governor. There is not the least ground for imagining that Barabbas, who seems to have been so popular a character notwithstanding the recent outrage, at the time of our Lord's crucifixion, had headed one party of Jews against another; or that the contest, which terminated in death to some, had lain between Jews on both sides, and not between Jews and the Roman military.

Again, at the time of our Lord's trial, not only Pilate, but Herod also, the tetrarch of Galilee, was in Jerusalem ^o. There is no reason to suppose that, before this, the latter was a regular attendant at the feasts: on the contrary, if Luke xxiii. 8 be true, it follows demonstratively that he had not attended either the feast of Dedication, or the feast of Tabernacles, last; at both of which times Jesus had been in Jerusalem, teaching and performing miracles upon the spot. But, if he was now in attendance against his usage, he must have had express reasons to bring him there; especially as he was accompanied by a train of soldiers ^p; which, in a season of profound peace and tranquillity, like the

ⁿ Luke xxiii. 19. Matt. xxvii. 16. Mark xv. 7. John xviii. 40. ^o Luke xxiii. 7. ^p Ib. 11.

present, except for some urgent reason, would be a still more extraordinary circumstance.

Again, there was at this time a quarrel in existence between Herod and Pilate⁹; the cause of which consequently must have been some ground of offence, on one side or on both sides. But it would not be easy to conceive what offence Herod could have given to Pilate, at least in his official capacity; for an offence to Pilate, in that capacity, would also have been an offence to the emperor. It is very possible on the other hand, that Pilate might have given offence to Herod. The mere circumstance that the one was the tetrarch of Galilee, and the other the representative of the majesty of Cæsar, without any reference to the personal character of the parties, might suffice to account for that.

Again, the quarrel in question was made up this day, and in consequence of something which passed this day; whence we may infer that it was a quarrel of no long standing: the parties, between whom it existed, had probably never met since it had taken place, until they came together on this occasion in Jerusalem. If it was so speedily made up now when they did meet, had they met before this time, we may suppose it would have been made up sooner.

Again, it is impossible to peruse the account of St. Luke, xxiii. 6-12, and not to come to the conclusion that the moving cause to the reconciliation was the mission of Jesus to Herod by Pilate. Now this mission is expressly attributed to the discovery that Jesus belonged to the jurisdiction of Herod. The mission, therefore, was a compliment paid to the jurisdiction of Herod; it was as much as to declare that, without the consent of Herod, Pilate would not interfere in

⁹ Luke xxiii. 12.

the disposal of a person, whose proper master Herod might appear to be. And Herod understood it accordingly; for by first sitting in judgment on our Lord himself, and then sending him back to Pilate, he both asserted his authority over him, and resigned it voluntarily to Pilate. But if the cause of the final reconciliation was this deference to the rights of Herod, it becomes an argument that the cause of the misunderstanding previously was some injury done to those rights; which could not be repaired except by a public acknowledgment like this. The reputation of Jesus would necessarily render it an important question to whose jurisdiction in particular he ought to be considered amenable; and in sending him upon this occasion to Herod, Pilate was not only flattering the pride of that prince, but ministering also to the gratification of a wish to see Jesus, which he had long before conceived.

Again, it may be inferred from Luke xiii. 31–35, that our Lord could not be far from Jerusalem—that is, that his circuit was fast drawing to its close—when he heard of this misfortune of the Galileans: and by the time of his arrival at Bethany, six days before the Pass-over, numbers of the Jews were already assembled at Jerusalem^r. These are described as Jews from the country; and the purpose for which they went up, so much before the time, was to purify themselves against the feast. There can be no question that considerations of this kind—such as the close of the vow of separation; the purification of women after childbirth, whom their husbands would naturally accompany; besides various accidental pollutions, dependent upon circumstances—would bring up numbers to Jerusalem, some a greater, others a less time, before the feast, in

^r John xi. 55.

every year^s. Οὔτε γὰρ λεπροῖς, says Josephus, οὔτε γονορροίοις, οὔτε γυναιξὶν ἐπεμμήνοις, οὔτε τοῖς ἄλλως μεμιασμένοις, ἐξῆν τῇσδε τῆς θυσίας μεταλαμβάνειν^t. It is not to be supposed that any one, however previously clean, would delay his arrival later than the tenth of Nisan; and there is a parallel case, mentioned accidentally by Josephus, which proves that the resort of worshippers against the Passover, was going forward on and before the eighth^u: ἀθροίζομένου τοῦ λαοῦ πρὸς τὴν τῶν Ἀζύμων ἑορτήν· ὁ γδὲ δ' ἦν Ξανθικοῦ μηνός.

Laying these several particulars together, I think we may come to the following inferences partly with an absolute certainty, and partly with an high degree of probability: first, that a contest had taken place in Jerusalem, arising out of a disturbance of the public peace, between the Jews and the Roman soldiers, attended by blood-shed on both sides, the scene of which was partially the temple; secondly, that this was the sedition of Barabbas, for which he was still in prison, when Jesus was brought before Pilate; thirdly, that some of the Galileans, the native subjects of Herod, while engaged in the act of sacrificing, had been innocently sufferers from it; fourthly, that this violence done to them was the cause of the enmity existing between Herod and Pilate, and the reason why the former was present in Jerusalem, at the time of the last Passover, with an armed force, for his own protection, or for that of his subjects; fifthly, that all this was of recent occurrence, between the time denoted by John xi. 54 and xii. 1: after the commencement of our Lord's final circuit, and not long before its close.

It is some confirmation of the connection between this incident, thus alluded to, Luke xiii. 1, and what

^s Vide 2 Chron. xxix. xxx.

^t Bell. Jud. vi. ix. 3.

^u Bell. vi. v. 3.

subsequently passed at our Lord's examination, xxiii. 6–12, that the former does serve to clear up the latter, and that both are related by St. Luke, and by him alone. There is no proof, it is true, in Josephus of any disturbance in Jerusalem, about this time: but neither is there any account, given by him, of the administration of Pilate generally, except after the close of our Lord's personal history, and so far as regards one or two particulars—his introduction of the ensigns into the city; his sequestration of the corban; and his violence towards the Samaritans: the last of which led to his removal from office, and the two former, or at least the latter of them, as I apprehend, had not yet taken place. Nor is any greater objection deducible from the silence of Josephus as to this fact in particular, than from his silence with respect to Christianity in general. If the fact in question was connected with the sedition of Barabbas, then the history of Barabbas was too intimately connected also with the personal history of Jesus Christ, to be noticed distinctly by an author who has preserved so deep, and undoubtedly so deliberate a secresy, with respect to this last.

It seems to have been ordained by Providence, and with an evident fitness and expediency, that the whole of our Lord's public ministry until this time should be transacted with no such events as these: nor can I help thinking that the occurrence of something of the kind, at last, was more permissive than accidental; and as providential as any thing before it. For had not this been the case, no such notorious criminal as Barabbas could have been in confinement at the time of the trial of our Lord; and if Barabbas had not then been in prison, whom could the Jews have demanded to be released instead of the Christ? and without this pre-

ference of Barabbas to the Christ, what room could there have been for that last and most convincing testimony to the national impenitence and guilt, which was given by their deliberate preference of a robber and an outlaw, a ringleader of sedition, with hands imbrued in blood ; not merely to a person whose innocence was undoubted, and the purity of whose character was unimpeachable, but to their own Messiah, the Prince of peace, and Saviour of mankind ?

DISSERTATION XXXVI.

*On the question concerning divorce, Matt. xix. 3-12. Mark
x. 2-12.*

THE reason why St. Luke has omitted all mention of this question, and of the answer to it, appears to be, because a similar, and very probably a recent declaration on the same subject is recorded by him^a, not long before the point of time^b where his narrative again joins St. Matthew and St. Mark. In the account of the two latter Evangelists themselves, compared together, there is the same evidence of omissions on the one hand, and of supplements on the other, as repeatedly occurs elsewhere; and this fact being once established, it will naturally go some way to reconcile the differences between them.

For example, when Jesus had replied to the question of the Pharisees—which was put in public, and answered in public, he retired into some private house^c. There is no notice, either express or by implication, of this fact in St. Matthew. While he was in this house, the disciples, according to the same authority, renewed the inquiry concerning the question: neither is this fact noticed by St. Matthew. Yet what he attributes to the disciples^d must have made a part of this conversation in private: it has all the appearance of a remark, produced by the repetition to them in particular of what had lately been pronounced in the hearing of all in common. If so, it becomes a proof that our Lord, at this period in St. Matthew's account, was actually in private; and this conclusion is confirmed by the incident

^a Ch. xvi. 18.

^b Ch. xviii. 15.

^c Mark x. 10.

^d Ch. xix. 10.

next subjoined, the bringing of little children to Christ^e; for that transaction took place *after* he came into the house, and *before* he left it again; that is, while he was still within^f.

We may conclude therefore that the final end, which St. Mark had here in view, was to supply certain particulars in a common account, omitted by St. Matthew. Hence he is in some respects fuller, and in others more concise, than he: fuller, where St. Matthew had been most defective, and more concise, where he had been most minute. On this principle they may easily be accommodated to each other.

For first, the question, according to St. Matthew, stood thus—Εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν; according to St. Mark—Εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι; in which, consequently, there is an omission of κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν: and this is an omission which must have been intentional. For the decision of our Lord himself^g shews that, on *one* account, the account of fornication, which in a married woman amounts to adultery, it *is lawful* to put away a wife. The question, then, Is it lawful for an husband to put away his wife? so expressed, might be answered in the affirmative; the question, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife, on *any account*? must be answered in the negative. The true drift of the question therefore, as stated by St. Mark, supposes the statement of it by St. Matthew to be carried along with his.

Secondly, in reply to the question, our Lord, according to St. Mark, began with referring to the decision of Moses; according to St. Matthew, he proceeded to answer it himself^h. If he did both these

^e Ch. xix. 13—15.

^f Mark x. 10. 17.

^g Matt. xix. 9.

^h Mark x. 3. Matt. xix. 4.

things, there is no inconsistency between these statements; and in favour of that supposition we may argue as follows.

When, in other instances, a question was put to our Saviour, which either had been actually decided by the Law, or was easily to be collected from it, we observe him refer in the first place to the Lawⁱ; and as this was a case in point, it might naturally be expected that he would do the same now. But had he never done so on any other occasion, there were yet special reasons why he should do so on this.

It is notorious that liberty of divorce had been conceded by the Law of Moses^k: it is certain also that, at the first institution of marriage, it had been pronounced inseparable. It follows, therefore, that the concession of the Law had been contrary to the original institution; and consequently was a special indulgence, vouchsafed to the Jews. Hence, as there was once a time when no such indulgence existed, so there might be again a time when it should be repealed.

If then the original law was to be revived by the Gospel, and made binding on Christians, the temporary indulgence, granted subsequently to the Jews, was necessarily to cease. The design therefore of referring in the first place to the decision of the Law might be to give greater solemnity to the decision of Christ. It would intimate so much the more clearly both the fact of the abrogation of the existing commandment, and the grounds on which it was to take place. What did Moses command you? was consequently a natural, and even a necessary question, before any declaration of our Lord himself. The judgment, which he meant to

ⁱ Matt. xix. 16, 17, 18. Luke x. 25, 26.

^k Deut. xxiv. 1, 2.

pronounce, would apparently commit his authority with the authority of Moses ; and he proposed to shew beforehand that this committal was only apparent, not real. The Mosaic injunction itself was an extraordinary and a temporary concession ; not more opposed to his own decision, than to an original and prior law, recorded by Moses himself ; which, as it had once prevailed before the dispensation, so notwithstanding that, might recover its ascendancy again.

The interrogation recorded even by St. Matthew ¹, *τί οὖν Μωσῆς ἐνετείλατο, κ. τ. λ.* contains an implicit allusion to some such reference concerning the dictum of the Law. The parties, who put that question, were the same as before ; and it is manifest that they put it by way of objection to the decision just pronounced. Our Saviour, it is true, had anticipated the objection in the decision itself ; but that the Pharisees should not have been satisfied with *his* reasons would be nothing extraordinary : and if they thought proper to start the same difficulty afresh, it would be just as natural that he should reply to it as he had done before. They had not originally put their question out of a genuine deference to his authority, or with a candid disposition to receive instruction from him on an important article of duty ; but from some insidious motive ; either to elicit a declaration, which they knew would be repugnant to the mandate of the Law, or to render Jesus obnoxious to the people. They could not be ignorant that, twice at least in the course of his ministry, once in the sermon on the mount, and again still more recently in their own hearing ^m, he had peremptorily laid down a new principle of conduct upon this very point.

Nor was there any thing more palatable to the people at large, nor yet more grossly abused, than

¹ Ch. xix. 7.

^m Matt. v. 31, 32. Luke xvi. 14. 18.

this liberty of divorce. The license of polygamy allowed by the doctors of the Law, and practised by the Jews every where, was almost unlimited. Justin Martyr tells us that the former openly permitted any man to have four or five wives; and that the latter freely availed themselves of this permission, marrying as many as they pleasedⁿ. Besides this, however, the right of divorce was carried to an excess which rendered the marriage union, whatever it might be in profession, little better in practice than the liberty of promiscuous concubinage. There was no conceivable reason, however slight, for which a man might not put away one woman, and marry another. Γυναικὸς τῆς συνοικουμένης βουλόμενος διαζευχθῆναι, καθ' ἃς δημοτοῦν αἰτίας· πολλαὶ δ' ἂν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τοιαῦται γίνονται^o. Josephus himself is an example^p to prove the universality of the practice of divorce, as well as the slightness of the reasons for which it might be resorted to. With respect however to the grounds of separation, considered justifiable by the rabbis, *pudet, pigetque*! If a wife had spoiled her husband's dinner—nay more, if she was no longer to his liking, if he had found one that would suit him better—he was at liberty to put her away^q. Schola Schamai dicit, nemo repudiabit uxorem, nisi in ea repertum fuerit quid inhonesti . . . Schola Hillelis dicit, etiamsi combusserit decoctum ejus . . . R. Akiba dicit, etiamsi illa pulchriorem inveniat aliam. And yet while the husbands were allowed thus freely to divorce their wives, the wives were not permitted to divorce their husbands.

On a subject like this, where the temporary indulgence, permitted by the Law, had come to be so flagrantly abused, it is not credible that our Saviour,

ⁿ Dialogus, 423. l. 8—11. 436. l. 23—31.

^p Vita, 76.

^q Mishna, iii. 358. 10.

^o Ant. Jud. iv. viii. 23.

as often as there was occasion for it, would hesitate to enforce or repeat the decision, the most worthy of himself. Accordingly he repeats it now, as it might be expected a solemn and ultimate declaration would be repeated, with more emphasis and distinctness of expression, with more weight of authority, and force of reasoning, than ever before. Yet for all this might not the Pharisees in particular be convinced by it ; and if *his* decision was in any manner opposed to the authority of Moses, it is easy to see which *they* would affect to defer to. There was no means, however, of answering our Saviour, except by appealing to Moses ; and though he had met that appeal already, yet an argument, which supposed any part of their law to be designed for a temporary purpose, was not likely to satisfy them. Nor is it more extraordinary that *they* should have continued, or pretended to continue unconvinced, than that the disciples of our Lord himself, from the strangeness, and probably the disagreeableness of his doctrine, should have inquired about it again.

The arrangement, then, of the two narratives will stand as follows :

I. Matt. xix. 3, Mark x. 2 : the original question, as recorded by St. Matthew.

II. Mark x. 3, 4, 5 : the interrogation of our Lord—the reply to that interrogation—and the declaration subjoined to the reply, shewing the grounds of the legal injunction.

III. Matt. xix. 4, 5, 6, Mark x. 6, 7, 8, 9 : which proceed in conjunction, down to the close of St. Mark's account of what passed in public ; and may be harmonized thus :

First, if we retain the interrogatory form of St. Matthew, and supply the particle $\delta\epsilon$ from St. Mark, $\text{o}\upsilon\kappa$

ἀνέγνωτε (δὲ) ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς, ὁ Θεός;

Secondly, as supplied by St. Matthew, and as part of the quotation from Genesis, καὶ εἶπεν (sc. ὁ Θεός)· ἕνεκεν τούτου . . down to χωρίζέτω—which is *verbatim* the same in both.

IV. Matt. xix. 7 : the objection from the Law, as repeated by the Pharisees—xix. 8 : our Lord's reply to it, as before, but more concisely than before—xix. 9 : a renewed declaration concerning the unlawfulness of promiscuous divorce, similar to what had been pronounced Matt. v. 31, 32, Luke xvi. 18, upon former occasions, but not as yet on this occasion : which concludes St. Matthew's account of what passed in public.

V. Mark x. 10, 11, 12 : the renewal of the conversation with the disciples in private ; where at verses 11, 12, there is a clear reference to Matt. xix. 9, the concluding declaration in public : which yet, without that, would not have been intelligible.

VI. And, lastly, Matt. xix. 10, 11, 12 : which will close not only St. Matthew's, but also the *whole* account. The remark of the disciples that it was better not to marry at all, than to marry on such terms as these, is manifestly such as might have been produced by Mark x. 11, 12 ; and the reason why St. Matthew has mentioned it after xix. 9 in particular, may be that it followed upon the repetition of the same declaration *within*, which had recently been pronounced *without* ; and it was due to the same cause, the dislike of the doctrine, or at least the surprise entertained at the doctrine, whether as prescribed *without* to the people or as repeated *within* to the disciples.

DISSERTATION XXXVII.

On the miracles performed at Jericho.

IN the account of these miracles St. Luke is apparently at variance with St. Mark, and St. Matthew apparently with St. Luke and St. Mark^a; the former, on the question of place, or as to where the miracle was performed; the latter, on the question of persons, or who was the subject of the miracle, whether one person or more.

St. Luke's language is so clear as to the performance of *his* miracle, before the procession of Jesus arrived at Jericho, and St. Mark's, as to the performance of *his*, when the procession had passed through it, that it would be a vain attempt to prove the locality of these two events the same; or that either miracle was performed as Jesus drew nigh to Jericho, or as Jesus was leaving Jericho. It would be equally preposterous to suppose that he made any stay at Jericho; and so might perform one miracle as he first came thither, and another, as he finally left it again. The first verse of the nineteenth chapter of St. Luke is decisive that Jesus passed through Jericho without stopping; or if there is any doubt on this subject, the next Dissertation, I trust, will place it beyond a question. The two accounts, then, are still as much at variance as before; relating to the course of one and the same procession from the banks of the Jordan through Jericho without interruption, until it stopped for a time with Zaccheus. Or if the miracle in St. Luke is to be considered the same with that in St. Mark, they are even more at variance than before.

^a Luke xviii. 35—43. Mark x. 46—52. Matt. xx. 29—34.

I know no means, therefore, of reconciling either of them with the other, or both with St. Matthew, except one; a mode of reconciliation, handed down from the earliest times, and not more recommended by its antiquity than by its simplicity—which is to suppose two miracles, each at distinct times, and on a different individual*; the one, as our Lord was approaching to Jericho, the other, as he was leaving it again; the former, related by St. Luke, the latter by St. Mark, and both, by St. Matthew; each, as distinctly related, related in its proper place; and the two, as related conjointly, not absolutely related out of theirs: for one or the other of them, even in St. Matthew, must be regularly related, though the other were not.

The general conciseness of this Evangelist, in the account of miracles, has been often pointed out already; and on the principle of this conciseness, his blending together the history of two miracles, the same in kind, very similar in their circumstances, and almost contiguous in point of time; if any such events really occurred; was *a priori* to be expected from him: in which case, it is much the most probable that he would connect the history of the first performed, with the account of the last; that is, would relate the last performed in its place, and the first out of it, rather than do the contrary. The approach of Jesus to Jericho St. Matthew does not even mention; but the departure from it again he does: unless therefore he had purposely travelled out of his way, in order to relate the first miracle for its own sake (to do which would not have been consistent with his practice) he had not even an opportunity of recording *that*, until

* Cf. Origen, iii. 732. Commentarius in Matt. tom. xvi. 12. Theophylact, i. 108. C. In Matt. xx.

the time arrived for the history of the other. Nor, when he is proceeding to recount them both, or to give the history of one *out* of its order, along with the history of the other *in* it, does he employ any formula of transition which establishes an immediate succession of events. He ushers in the account merely by his idiomatic expression, καὶ ἰδοὺ^b: a phrase which, in numberless instances, is simply a note of admonition to the reader, preparing him for something remarkable about to be related, but not a note of time or sequence, referring him to the order and connection of events.

The Gospel of St. Mark coming after St. Matthew's, and every where closely treading in the steps of St. Matthew's, it was quite sufficient that St. Matthew had recorded both the miracles in conjunction, to induce St. Mark to relate only one of them in particular. St. Luke's Gospel coming after both their's, and being written with a perfect knowledge of the accounts of each, it was equally sufficient to make him record only one that St. Mark had recorded the other; and to make him record this one in its proper place that St. Matthew had recorded it, but with the other, out of its place. The time of the *double* miracle in St. Matthew is clearly the same with that of the *single* miracle in St. Mark; that is, the miracle on Bartimæus, recorded by the latter, is the second of the miracles, related by the former. By restricting therefore *his* account to this one miracle, St. Mark still went along with St. Matthew; and by specifying this as a single miracle, he not only went along with him, but so far rectified his order; for this was to detach the one miracle from another of like kind, but upon a different occasion, which St. Matthew had combined with it. The approach to Jericho is not mentioned by him, no more than by St. Matthew; so

^b Ch. xx. 30.

that, unless he had purposely chosen to relate the other miracle also, he could have had no opportunity of recording *that*, except in conjunction with the second. But this his scrupulous regard for historical precision would not allow him to do; nor in fact was it likely that he would do it; for it would have been merely to repeat what St. Matthew had done previously, and to perpetuate the very anachronism, which, as it was, he desired to remove. There was something also in the case of the second blind man, different from that of the first; as the very description given of him—*ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου, Βαρ-τίμαιος, ὁ τυφλός*^c—is alone sufficient to prove: and this would be an additional reason for confining the account of the miracle to him.

It remains then that the details of the first miracle, as a part of the general narrative, could be given by St. Luke alone. St. Matthew's account, as to the number of the miracles, was complete; as to their order, was irregular: St. Mark's account, as to the order, was regular; as to the number, was incomplete. St. Luke's serves an equal purpose with respect to both; filling up the deficiency in St. Mark, and reducing to order the irregularity in St. Matthew. The *two single* miracles therefore of the later Evangelists are exactly equivalent to the *one double* miracle of the earlier; and the accounts of the two former, laid together, will be just coextensive with the account of the latter by itself. Nor is there any thing in them separately considered, to militate against such a construction of their relation to each other in common. Had St. Matthew affirmed that both his miracles were wrought *after* Jesus left Jericho, then indeed St. Luke's miracle could not have been one of *those*, though it might still have been

^c Ch. x. 46. Cf. Theophylact, i. 229. D. In Marc. x.

a matter of fact. Had St. Luke asserted that the name and description of *his* blind man were Timæus, the son of Timæus, *his* authority would have been committed directly with St. Mark's. But as it is, each account in particular may be true; and all in common may be consistent with each other.

The nature of the case is enough to prove that it is by no means an improbable supposition, which merely assumes that *two* blind men, neither of whom had any means of subsistence except from the benevolence of private charity, might be found sitting and begging in the vicinity of a city like Jericho, in point of size only one third, or not much more, less than Jerusalem^d, and containing, probably, more than one hundred thousand inhabitants; and upon two such thoroughfares, as the road from the Jordan to Jericho and from Jericho to Jerusalem. But, even in this case, it is much more likely that they would be found apart than in conjunction. The procession of our Saviour would consequently pass by them at separate times; and there is no circumstance in the situation, behaviour, or treatment of the one, which was not *a priori* to be just as much expected of the other. The similarity then of the different accounts is no proof of the identity of the occasions to which they belong; for they could not have been otherwise than similar. It was this very similarity which brought them readily within the scope of St. Matthew's plan of conciseness in such details as these, and induced him to blend them both into one narrative. The particulars of the account, which he has thus given in reference to both, must have been individually applicable to either of them. Both must have been sitting by the road side, and must both have been begging, when Jesus passed by; both must have inquired

^d Epiphanius, Operum i. 702. C. Manichæi, lxxxii.

who was passing, and both must have been told that it was Jesus of Nazareth ; both must have implored his mercy ; both must have been rebuked by the people ; both must have cried out the more ; both must have been conducted to Christ ; both must have been questioned alike ; both must have returned the same answer ; both must have been restored to sight by a word and a touch ; and both must have followed him in the way. Each I say must have done all these things, according to St. Matthew, if either of them did : and St. Luke or St. Mark has merely related of one of them, what St. Matthew with equal truth had recorded of the two.

DISSERTATION XXXVIII.

On the time of the arrival at Bethany—and on the day of the procession to the Temple.

THE last division of the Gospel-history, dated from the arrival at Bethany before the fourth Passover, and extending to the day of the Ascension, abounds in difficulties, and in controverted or controvertible points. The time of the arrival at Bethany; the time of the supper and the unction, which there took place; the time of the procession to Jerusalem; the time of the cleansing of the temple; the time of the celebration of the last supper: all these, and many more which it is not necessary now to enumerate, are questions upon which the utmost difference of opinion, and a corresponding diversity of arrangement in the schemes of particular harmonists, are seen to exist.

Yet these difficulties, great as they are, we must now proceed to encounter. The course of our subject has brought us regularly down to the period when Jesus, having formally made an end of his ministry in Galilee and elsewhere, was about to complete it in Jerusalem also; and at the same time to accomplish the work of human redemption—the proper work which the Father had given him to execute; the final end of his coming into the world: which being over, the period of his leaving the world and of his returning again to the Father, with whom he was before he assumed flesh, could not be far distant.

In the due prosecution of this subject, I shall enter first upon the question of the time of the arrival at Bethany; the determination of which is absolutely ne-

cessary to fix the beginning of Passion-week, and to facilitate the arrangement of succeeding events.

The narratives of the first three Evangelists, from the time when our Saviour passed through Jericho, to that of his actual entry into Jerusalem, exhibit no interruption in their continuity. In these narratives, then, there is no intimation of any intermediate stay at Bethany; much less of the date of the arrival there. Nor does this silence imply that no interval actually took place between the day of the arrival, and the day of the procession to the temple; no more than that the arrival itself did not take place upon some definite day in particular. It implies only that nothing took place between the arrival and the procession, which it might be necessary or expedient for the former Gospels to relate; it implies also that the interval in question was short: and both these things, as we shall see by and by, were actually matters of fact.

The precise date of the arrival, and the exact measure of the interval between that event and the procession to Jerusalem, which had thus been omitted by each of the former Gospels, could be supplied only by the last. Accordingly, the supplementary relation of that Gospel, which has been so often exemplified already, is critically illustrated in this instance also; for the notice of time which is wanting in the first three Gospels is found at xii. 1 of the fourth: *ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς, πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ Πάσχα, ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν*. The date of the arrival at Bethany, and all the other consequences deducible from it, depend upon the right construction of this text.

Now with regard to such phrases as these, *πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ Πάσχα*, or, *μεθ' ἑξ ἡμέρας τοῦ Πάσχα*, where the prepositions of time, *πρὸ* or *μετὰ*, are constructed with one substantive (denoting days, or weeks, or

months, or years, *pro re nata*) in their proper case, and another substantive serving as the material date, to which, or from which, the computation proceeds, the first observation that we may make is this: they are not strictly *classical*; that is, they are seldom, if ever, to be met with in the earlier Greek authors, such as Herodotus, Thucydides, or Xenophon *, but only in the later: the reason of which distinction is obvious; that they are not Greek idioms, but an imitation of the Roman. Of this idiom in the Latin writers the following are instances: Alterum...ante paucos triumphi; alterum post pauciores, amisit dies—Intra quinque consummati tanti operis dies—Ante quintum mensem divortii—Intra sextum adoptionis diem—Post biduum...exortûs ^a. Analogous to this is the use of the prepositions *ante* or *post*, either with their proper case, as Quadragesimum post annum—Ante tres et sexaginta annos—or adverbially ἀπλῶς, as Biennio post—and the like ^b. The Greek construction answerable to this would be such as, καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἑξ—καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀκτώ—πρὸ ... τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν—πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων ^c—between which and the former, πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ Πάσχα, and the like, it is manifest that, as to the principle of their construction, there can be no difference whatever.

The next observation which we may make is this :

* The only passage which I have met with in these historians, that seems to militate against the assertion in question, occurs at the beginning of the Hellenica of Xenophon, §. 2: μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ τούτων: a passage

which on this very account I should agree with Kœppen in considering suspicious, and should correct either by omitting the τούτων, or adding as he proposes ὕστερον.

^a Velleius Pat. i. 10. ii. 117. Suetonius, Claudius, 27. Galba, 17. Pliny, H. N. ii. 47. ^b Tacitus, Ann. xii. 27. xiii. 53. Suetonius, Augustus, 26.

^c Mark ix. 2. John xx. 26. Acts v. 36. 2 Cor. xii. 2.

notices of time, so expressed, are not to be understood either *inclusively*, or *exclusively*, of both their extremes; but *inclusively* of the one, and *exclusively* of the other. This assertion is notoriously true of the Roman idiom in reckoning the days of the month; according to which Ante diem sextum kalendas (for instance) of January would denote the sixth day inclusive of the first of January; not December 26, but December 27. Nor is it less correct in reference to the application of the same mode of computation to historical notices of time; which is the proper rule to be followed in interpreting the text of St. John. I have illustrated the usage in question by the production of passages below first from Latin authors, and then from Greek; the effect of which must be to prove demonstratively that if St. John's reckoning is *exclusive* of the day of the arrival, it is *inclusive* of the day of the Passover; and if it is *exclusive* of the day of the Passover, it is *inclusive* of the day of the arrival: and in either case, if the day of the Passover was the fourteenth of the Jewish Nisan, the day of the arrival was the eighth*.

* I. Bellum Carthagini jam ante biennium a prioribus consulibus illatum majore vi intulit. Velleius Pat. i. 12, 13.

Scipio, who is here alluded to, was consul U. C. 607. The former consuls, also alluded to, were Censorinus and Manilius, U. C. 605: or *two* entire years before U. C. 607.

II. The death of Cato is placed ante triennium quam Carthago deleteretur, (Velleius Pat. i. 13. 12.) Censorino et Manilio coss: U. C. 605. Carthage was destroyed Coss. Lentulo et Mum-

mio, U. C. 608: *three* full years afterwards.

III. Ante septem annos ex consulatu sortitus Asiam. Ibid. ii. 33. This is meant of Lucullus, who was consul U. C. 680. The lex Manilia, which superseded him by Pompey, was passed Tullo et Lepido coss. U. C. 688^d: *eight* full years after the consulship of Lucullus, and seven after his appointment to Asia.

IV. Secundum consulatum post novem annos. Suetonius, Augustus, 26. Augustus' first consulship was U. C. 711—his

^d Dio xxxvi. 25, 26.

Tried by the rule, which the instances in question are fully competent to establish, St. John's note of time,

second, U. C. 721, in the *tenth* year afterwards.

V. *Biennio* post. Ibid. His twelfth consulship was U. C. 749—his thirteenth U. C. 752, in the *third* year after.

VI. Testamentum, L. Planco C. Silio consulibus (U. C. 766.) tertium nonas Aprilis, ante annum et quatuor menses quam decederet, factum. Ibid. 102. Augustus died xiv. kalendas Septembres, U. C. 767; one year, and part of a *fifth* month, after the date of his will.

VII. Post *novem* menses quam Tiberius excessit, xviii. kalendas Januarias. Suetonius, Nero, 6. Tiberius died xvii. kalendas April. U. C. 790^e; whence to xviii. kalendas Januar. in the same year, are *nine* months complete.

VIII. *Intra sextum* adoptionis diem. Suetonius, Galba, 17. It appears from Tacitus that this was *on* the sixth day itself^f.

IX. *Octo* post annos. Tacitus, Ann. iv. 8. Drusus was poisoned U. C. 776, *medio*. Sejanus perished xv. kalendas Novemb. U. C. 784^g, in the *ninth* year afterwards.

X. *Octo* post annos. Ibid. 29. Libo was condemned U. C. 769^h; Serenus was banished U. C. 777: in the *ninth* year afterwards.

XI. *Sextum* post cladis annum. Ibid. i. 62. *Quadragesimum* post annum. Ibid. xii. 27. That the first of these notes of time means in the *seventh* year, and the second in the *forty-first*,

has been shewn elsewhereⁱ.

XII. Ante annos *nonaginta*^k. Pliny, H. N. vii. 49. This means from U. C. 672 *inclusive* to U. C. 762 *exclusive*; that is, in the *ninety-first* year.

XIII. Τὸ σπέρμα βάλλοντας... μετὰ τέτταρας ἢ πέντε μῆνας ἀπαντᾶν ἐπὶ τὸν θερισμόν. Diodorus Sic. i. 36. This means *four* months, or *five*, exclusive of the time of sowing.

XIV. Ὁ τε γὰρ Σατουρνίνος πρό ἔξ πον καὶ τριάκοντα ἐτῶν ἐτεθνήκει. Dio xxxvii. 26. Cf. Asconius in Oratorem contra Pisonem. This is spoken of U. C. 691: from which to U. C. 654. Coss. C. Mario vi. L. Valerio Flacco, the year of the death of Saturninus, were *thirty-seven* years complete^l.

XV. Μετὰ τριάκοντα ἡμέρας τῶν γάμων. Dio, lix. 28. That is, (vide cap. 23. ἵνα αὐτῷ παιδίον τριακονθήμερον τέκη)—on the *thirty-first* day, inclusive of the day of the marriage; otherwise the child could not have been just thirty days, or one entire month, old at its birth.

XVI. Ἡρμημένον μὲν πρό δέκα ἐτῶν Ἰβηρίας ἀρξάι. Dio, lviii. 8. This enemy of Sejanus was L. Arruntius. Tacitus, however^m, and Dio are at variance, with respect to this fact in his history. According to the former, he had been kept back from his government *ten* years, U. C. 786 *exeunte*—two years after the death of Sejanus. According to the latter, he had been kept back from

^e Tiberius, 73.

^f Historiæ, i. 29.

^g Annales, vi. 25. Dio lviii. 9.

^h Annales, ii. 27.

ⁱ Dissertation viii. Vol. i. 337, 338.

^k Harduin reads,

nonaginta unum. ^l Velleius Pat. ii. 12. Orosius, v. 17. ^m Tacitus, Ann. vi. 27. 48.

πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ Πάσχα, whatever may be meant by τὸ Πάσχα, cannot imply less than this: viz. that exclusive

it the same length of time, U.C. 784, the year of Sejanus' destruction, at least. If so, the time of his first appointment, as intended by Dio, was probably the occasion alluded to by Tacitus, U.C. 774, when others were appointed to provinces *extra ordinem*^m. From that time to U.C. 784 *inclusive*, the interval was *eleven* years.

XVII. Ὡδε μὲν... Ῥωμαῖοι... Καρχηδόνα κατέσκαψάν τε, καὶ συνώκισαν αὐθις μετὰ ἔτη τῆς σκαφῆς ἑκατὸν καὶ δύο. Appian, De Rebus Punicis, viii. 136. Carthage was destroyed U. C. 608: and a colony was again planted there U. C. 710.

XVIII. Μετὰ δέκα ἔτη τοῦ οἰκῆσαι Ἀβραὰμ ἐν γῇ Χαναάν: Philo Judæus, i. 429. l. 30. De Congressu; which being taken from the 6. Gen. xvi. 3, is proved by a comparison with Gen. xii. 4, xvi. 16, to denote the *eleventh* year since the departure from Haran; or the eighty-fifth of the age of Abraham.

XIX. Πρὸ μῆας, id est τὸ πρὸ τῆς ἐβδόμης: Ibid. ii. 113. 36. 114. 4. De Mose.

XX. Ἡ οὐκ ἠδύνατο πρὸ μῆας ἡμέρας, ἢ μετὰ μίαν ἡμέραν, τοῦ σαββάτου ἐνεργεῖν τοὺς γεννωμένους; Justin Martyr, Dialogus, 191. l. 9—Μετὰ μίαν τῆς ἀλώσεως ἡμέραν: Bell. Jud. i. vii. 6—Πρὸ δυοῖν ἡμερῶν: Ibid. xxx. 1—Μετὰ μίαν ἡμέραν: Ibid. xxxii. 5—Πρὸ ἡμέρας μῆας: ii. viii. 9—Μετὰ μίαν ἡμέραν: iii. vii. 4—Πρὸ μῆας ἡμέρας, and, Μετά... μίαν ἡμέραν... τῆς ἀνόδου: v. iii. 3. vi. ii.

8—Πρὸ τῆς παρελθούσης νυκτός: Ant. x. x. 3—Πρὸ μῆας ἡμέρας: xiii. v. 7—Πρὸ μῆας ἡμέρας ἢ: xiv. xii. 4—Πρὸ μῆας ἡμέρας τῆς ἑορτῆς: xv. xi. 4—Μετὰ μίαν τῆς ἑορτῆς ἡμέραν: xviii. iv. 3—In all which instances the day after, or the day before, a certain date *exclusive* is meant alike.

XXI. Μετὰ δὲ ἡμέρας ἐπτὰ: Ant. iii. vi. 6—Every sabbath day. Μετὰ τὴν ἕκτην ἡμέραν: Contra Apionem, ii. 2—On the seventh day. Ποιεῖν δὲ καὶ τοῦτο μεθ' ἐβδόμην ἐτῶν ἐβδομάδα. ταῦτα πεντήκοντα μὲν ἐστὶν ἔτη τὰ πάντα: Ant. iii. xii. 3—Ἐδεῖ γὰρ ἀφείσθαι μετὰ ἑξαετίαν: xvi. i. 1—In the *seventh* year.

XXII. Ἐνδεκάτῳ μὲν ἔτει τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τελευτῆς, ἐπὶ δὲ Ὀλυμπιάδος ἐβδόμης καὶ δεκάτης καὶ ἑκατοστῆς: Contra Apionem, i. 22. p. 1184. Alexander died Ol. 114. 1. B. C. 324. Olympiad 117. 1. answers to B. C. 312, and 324—12=312.

XXIII. Ἔθος εἶχεσθαι πρὸ τριᾶκοντα ἡμέρων ἥς ἀποδώσειν μέλουσι θυσίας: Bell. Jud. ii. xv. 1—Maimonides, De Cultu divinoⁿ; Nazareatus nunquam paucioribus triginta diebus conficiebatur. quocirca privatus sacerdos, qui sacra administrabat, *tricesimo quoque die* tonderetur oportebat—Quisquis dixerit, Ecce ego sum Nasiræus! ille tondetur *trigesimo primo die*^o. Upon which Bartenoras; Tondetur *trigesimo primo die*, quia Nazareatus absolutus est *triginta* dierum.

XXIV. Πρὸ τεσσάρων ἐτῶν τοῦ

^m Annales, iii. 32.

ⁿ De Ratione adeundi Templi, i. 11.

^o Mishna iii. 154. 3.

of the date of the Πάσχα, the day of the arrival was the *sixth* day previously; inclusive of the day of the arrival, the date of the Πάσχα was the *seventh* day

πολέμου: Bell. Jud. vi. v. 3. This is meant of U. C. 815 *medio*; and the war began U. C. 819 *ineunte*. Vide Dissertation xv. Vol. ii. 65.

XXV. Μετὰ ἐβδομήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἔτη τῆς Ἀσσυρίων βασιλείας: Ant. xiii. vi. 7—Æræ Seleucidarum 171 *ineunte*: 1 Macc. xiii. 41. 51.

XXVI. Πρὸ ἐτῶν τεσσάρων ἂν καρπὸν προβάλλῃ: Ant. iv. viii. 19—that is, four full years; for for three years the fruit was altogether unholy; in the *fourth* it was to be dedicated to God; in the *fifth*, but not until the *fifth*, it became free to the use of the owner.

XXVII. Μετὰ τεσσαρακοστὴν ἐβδόμην ἡμέραν: Bell. Jud. iii. viii. 9—that is, (see cap. vii. 33,) on the *forty-eighth*.

XXVIII. Μετ' εἰκοστὸν δὲ καὶ ἕκτον ἐνιαυτὸν: Jos. Vita, 3—that is, in his twenty-seventh year. For he was born in the first of Caius, U. C. 790: and it admits of proof that this journey of his to Rome was neither before U. C. 816, nor after U. C. 819—that is, he went in U. C. 817, and returned in U. C. 818.

XXIX. Μετὰ ἔτη τέσσαρα ἡ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Ἰούδαν ἀποθανεῖν: Ant. Jud. xiii. ii. 3—According to the account of Josephus, Judas was made high priest upon the death of Alcimus, and four years after the death of Menelaus, B. C. 162. Æræ Seleucidarum, 150. If so, he

was made high priest B. C. 158: and he continued in office until his death, *three* years after. He died, then, upon this supposition at the earliest, B. C. 156. Jonathan, his brother, became high priest at the feast of Tabernacles, Æræ Seleucidarum 160, B. C. 152: from whence to the same time B. C. 156, there were just *four* years complete^q.

XXX. Πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων. 2 Cor. xii. 2. This date will be proved elsewhere^r to be intended of U. C. 808, as referred to U. C. 794, or the *fifteenth* year before it *inclusive*. In like manner Gal. iii. 17, ὁ μετὰ ἔτη τετρακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα γεγονώς νόμος—must be understood of the 431st year, as the year in which the Law was given; the year after the exodus from Egypt; referred to the call of Abraham into Canaan^s.

XXXI. Μετὰ τὰς ἐξ τοῦ ὅτε ἐβαπτίσθη ἡμέρας, τῇ ἕκτῃ γενομένης τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἐν Κανᾷ τῆς Γαλιλαίας γάμον οἰκονομίας. Origen, iv. 162. C. in Joannem Comm. tom. x. 2. This computation proceeds from the supposed day of our Saviour's baptism; whence to the day of the marriage feast *inclusive*, the interval would be *seven* days^t.

For other examples of the same mode of speaking, or of computing time, see Artemidorus, Oneirocritica, iv. 2: iv. 34: iv. 44: v. p. 257: Ælian, De Natura Animalium, v. 52: vii. 23: xi. 14: xi. 19: xv. 26, &c.

^p Lev. xix. 23—25.

^q Ant. xii. x. 6. ix. 7. xi. 2. xiii. ii. 1. 3.

^r Vide

the Appendix.

^s Exod. xii. 40, 41.

^t John i. 29. 35. 44. ii. 1.

subsequently*. And with respect to the meaning of τὸ Πάσχα, though it may have two significations, the one particular, to denote the Paschal sacrifice, the other general, to denote the Paschal feast; and though the former might possibly be used exclusive of the latter, the latter never could be used exclusive of the former. The word Πάσχα could never be used for the complex of the Paschal feast, and not take in the day of the Passover in particular. The date therefore, πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ Πάσχα, can be understood of no term either earlier or later than the first day of the Paschal feast *in general*; the day of the Passover *in particular*. In this case, if the day of the Passover in particular was necessarily the fourteenth of the Jewish Nisan, the day of the arrival at Bethany, six days before that *exclusively*, or seven days before that *inclusively*, was necessarily the eighth of the same month.

Now the day of the Jewish Passover in the year of our Saviour's passion, as I am fully persuaded and as I hope to make it apparent hereafter, was the day upon which he suffered. This being the case, the day of the week on which he suffered was the fourteenth of Nisan, the day of the Jewish passover. But the day of the week on which he suffered was unquestionably the sixth, or Friday. If so, the fourteenth of Nisan, in the year when our Saviour suffered, coincided with Friday; and consequently so did the eighth with Saturday. It confirms this conclusion, that the fourteenth of Nisan, U.C. 783, A.D. 30, which is the true date of

* It must be admitted, I think, that the former of these two suppositions is the most natural and obvious mode in which a writer would express

himself; viz. reckoning backwards six days *from* the day of the Passover, *to* the day of the arrival at Bethany.

the year of the Passion, coincided with the Julian April 5: and therefore so did the eighth of Nisan with the Julian March 30: of which it has been argued elsewhere^u, and it will be further shewn hereafter, that the former fell out upon the Friday, and the latter upon the Saturday.

If we are right in these positions, the true date of our Saviour's arrival at Bethany, U. C. 783, A. D. 30, preparatory to the last Passover, was Saturday, March 30, on the corresponding day in the Jewish Nisan. It would seem, then, at first sight that he arrived on the Jewish sabbath. But this is no necessary consequence: for a Jewish day began with sunset and ended with sunset^v; and sunset, March 30, eight days later than March 22, the true date of the vernal equinox, would not be much earlier than 6. 30. P. M. It would be daylight, even after this, for one hour more; that is, for the whole of the first hour of the next Jewish day as such, the ninth *νυχθήμερον* of Nisan, the beginning of the first day of a new week: and if our Saviour, at the time of the expiration of the sabbath, that is, at sunset upon the eighth of Nisan, or the thirtieth of the Julian March—was within an hour's journey of Bethany, he might still arrive there on the evening of Saturday; yet not on the Jewish sabbath. And this I believe to have been actually the case.

For first, it has been shewn elsewhere^w that, at the point of time indicated by Matt. xix. 1, and Mark x. 1, our Lord was not only in Peræa, but arrived at the confines of Judæa: that the question of the Pharisees concerning divorce, the next thing which those two Evangelists record, took place on the evening of one day, and the passage through Jericho, preceded by the

^u Dissertation xii.

^v Lev. xxiii. 32.

^w Dissertation xxxi. Vol. ii.

crossing of the Jordan, on the morning of the next. That the Jordan was crossed to enter Judæa must be self-evident; and that it was crossed in this instance at the usual ford, called Bethabara, in the neighbourhood of Jericho, may presumptively be collected from our Saviour's proceeding, directly after, through that city. For this was to take the usual course; that is, to journey by the regular high road from the Jordan to Jerusalem. If, therefore, the proceedings of *one* entire day, the day when our Lord entered Judæa and passed through Jericho, begin to be specified at Mark x. 17, which speaks of the resumption of the journey, confirmed by Matt. xx. 1, which implies it to have been resumed in the morning; then, unless at the commencement of that day it could be proved that Jesus was somewhere within a day's journey from Bethany, there is no reason to suppose that he would arrive there before the night.

Now according to the Jerusalem Itinerary the distance from Jerusalem to Jericho was 18 Roman miles; and the distance from Jericho to the Jordan was 5: the whole distance then from Jerusalem to the ford of the Jordan, according to this calculation, was 23. The same distance is reckoned by Origen^x, ὡς πλατεῖ λόγῳ, at 180 stades from Bethany, or 195 from Jerusalem; which makes it 24 Roman miles and one third of a twenty-fifth. But according to Josephus^y, whose testimony ought to be the most credible of any, the true distance from Jerusalem to Jericho was 150 stades; and from Jericho to the Jordan, was 60. The whole distance therefore from Jerusalem to the Jordan was 210 stades; exactly an ordinary day's journey. And in the Jewish Mishna we find it represented as such^z.

^x Operum iv. 140. B. In Joh. tom. vi. 24. viii. 3.

^z i. 282. 2.

^y Ant. Jud. v. i. 4. Bell. iv.

The only difference is that from the Jordan to Bethany the distance was fifteen stades or almost two Roman miles less.

But it is to be observed, that before Jesus crossed the Jordan he was somewhere in *Peræa*. It is also to be observed that the ford, where he crossed it, was somewhere in the *Aulon* or *Perichorus* of Jordan; the nature of which we have had occasion to describe elsewhere. The breadth of this *Aulon* was 120 stades, or 12 English miles, in all; and that it was equally divided by the Jordan, or that the part upon the east was as wide as the part upon the west of that river, appears from this fact; that the Jordan was sixty stades, or half the breadth of the *Aulon*, remote from the borders of the plain of Jericho on one side, and therefore must have been another sixty stades, or the remaining half of its extent, remote from the inhabited country on the other; and *Abila*, a city there situated, is placed accordingly by Josephus^a, at that distance from the banks of the river. Now our Lord, before he crossed the Jordan, had spent the night in *Peræa*. Where, then, may we presume, had he spent it? Not in this *Aulon* itself; for that is described as a desert; but where houses and villages at least were to be found. Now this would not be the case except on the very verge of the *Aulon*; nor within much less than sixty stades of the ford of the Jordan. It is very possible, then, that when Jesus set out in the morning of the day of his passage through Jericho, he was the whole breadth of the *Aulon*, or 120 stades, remote from that city; and therefore 255 stades, 32 Roman miles, remote from Bethany: a distance which was probably too great to be accomplished conveniently in one day. Or though we should not suppose that he was actually

^a Ant. Jud. iv. viii. 1. v. i. 1.

32 miles distant from Bethany, yet if he was 28 or 30, that also would exceed, by three or four Roman miles, the measure of an ordinary day's journey.

It appears accordingly, that when Jesus had passed through Jericho he afterwards stopped with Zaccheus. This fact is enough to prove that the house of Zaccheus was somewhere between Jerusalem and Jericho; and if it was as near to the one as the other, or if it lay even midway between the two, it would be nine Roman miles only distant from Jerusalem; and seven only distant from Bethany.

Now when our Lord stopped with Zaccheus, I think there is reason to conclude that he was stopping for the night. Such at least is the natural inference both from his own words, *σήμερον γὰρ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου δεῖ με μένειν*, and from the remarks of the multitude, *ὅτι παρὰ ἄμαρ-τωλῷ ἀνδρὶ εἰσηλθε καταλῦσαι* *^b. It must be obvious in any case that he stopped for the purpose of refreshment; and therefore about the time of some meal; which no one will suppose could be the morning's, at the hour of *πρωτῆ*, nor the midday's, at the fifth hour of the day: and therefore, must have been the evening's, not earlier than the ninth †. Nor is it any objection

* The use of *καταλῦσαι*, absolutely, in this instance, is one among the other arguments that Jesus was preparing to stay with Zaccheus for the night. Such is its classical signification, when so used. It occurs elsewhere in the Gospels, in that sense: and in the Old Testament the Seventy often render by it, what means in the Hebrew, to tarry or abide all night.

† The father of the Levite, Judges xix. 9, tells him, accord-

ing to the marginal version, that it was *pitching-time*, even then when he was preparing to set out. This recognises a stated time of the day, when travellers were accustomed *καταλῦσαι*, or to stop for the night. Genesis xxvi. 17, *κατέλυσεν* is the version of the Seventy, for what in the Hebrew is "pitched his tent."

Dr. Shaw informs us, that the constant practice of himself and his party was to rise at day-break, set forward with the sun;

^b Luke xix. 5. 7.

that *σήμερον*, in the first of those passages, though it properly means *to-day*, is used for *this night*. It is so used in a still more unquestionable instance, Luke xxii. 34, Mark xiv. 30, where it can denote nothing but *this night*. It is still less seriously to be objected that what occurred with respect to Zaccheus, after passing through Jericho, occurred immediately after, or as soon as Jesus had left the city; and not, very possibly, some hours later, when he had accomplished proportionably so much more of the journey to Jerusalem.

But if Jesus actually stopped with Zaccheus on the way between Jericho and Jerusalem, and actually for the night, it seems a necessary inference that he stopped with him for the night which preceded his own arrival at Jerusalem. If so, he stopped with him on the night before the eighth of Nisan; that is, he stopped with him on the seventh, preparatory to the night of the eighth. This conclusion confirms our preceding deductions in a manner which almost places them beyond a question. For if our Saviour stopped with Zaccheus on the seventh of the Jewish Nisan, and spent with him the night of the eighth, he stopped with him just before the sabbath; and the reason for his stopping at all was not merely to distinguish the exemplary faith and goodness of disposition displayed by this Publican's recent conversion, but also the necessity of observing the sabbatic rest. I have shewn that, at the close of an ordinary day's journey after the passage through Jericho, he might

and to travel until the middle of the afternoon, (3 o'clock, the ninth hour,) when they began to look out for a place to pass the night in. Mr. Harmer's Observations, vol. iii. chap. v.

Obs. lxiii. 238.

This is exactly what I should conceive our Lord to have done on the day that he passed through Jericho, and remained with Zaccheus.

be as much as three or four miles distant from Bethany; and possibly even more. It is not to be supposed that he would stop until the usual day's journey had been accomplished; nor that he would continue his route, especially if the sabbath was at hand, when it had. The *παρασκευή*, or preparation of the sabbath, began on the Friday at the ninth hour of the day, or three in the afternoon; which was also among the Romans, at this period, the usual time of supper*; though perhaps among the Jews supper-time was much later than that. At the ninth hour of the day on Friday, the seventh of Nisan, our Lord, having set out *ἄμα πρῶτ'*, that is, at the first hour, from wheresoever he was in Peræa, and travelled through Jericho, at the rate of three Roman miles to the hour, might yet be within three or four miles of Bethany.

This distance it would be easy to accomplish, by setting out at sunset on the following day, so as to arrive at Bethany before the actual fall of night. There is an instance in Josephus which proves that, even upon ordinary occasions, supper-time among the Jews might be so late as the second hour of the night^c; that is, at *the* period of the vernal equinox, within an hour from the fall of night: and after the expiration

* Sic ignovisse putato | Me tibi, si cœnas hodie mecum. ¶. Ut libet. ¶. Ergo | Post *nonam* venies. Horace, *Epistolarum* i. vii. 69. Exul ab *octava* Marius bibit. Juvenal, i. 49—that is, an hour earlier than usual. Verum ubi declivi jam *nona* tepescere sole | Incipiet, seræque videbitur hora merendæ, &c. Calpurnius, *Ecloga* v. 60. Pollionem Asinium . . . nulla

res ultra decimam retinuit: ne epistolas quidem post eam horam legebat . . . sed totius diei lassitudinem duabus illis horis ponebat. Seneca, *De Tranquillitate*, cap. 15. §. 13. Cf. iii. Macc. v. 14: Pseudo-Aristeas apud Josephum, vol. ii. 130. *ad calc.* Appendix: Nicolaus Damascenus, *Vita Augusti*, xiii: Pliny, *Epistolarum* iii. 1. §. 8.

^c Vita, 44.

of the sabbath, it is probable that such would be always the case. It is not absolutely certain that the Jews, at this period of their history, observed an entire abstinence on the sabbath; though both Suetonius, and Justin the abbreviator of Trogus^v, seem to imply it*: but it

* To these we may perhaps add Martial: Quod bis murice vellus inquinatum, | Quod jejunia sabbatariorum. Lib. iv. iv. 6. No one at least, I should think, would be disposed to produce, as decisive evidence to the contrary, the testimony of the book of Judith, viii. 6. Plutarch, Symposiaca, iv. 5: Operum viii. 671, indeed observes: αὐτοὶ δὲ τῷ λόγῳ μαρτυροῦσιν ὅτι σάββατον τιμῶσι, μάλιστα μὲν πίνειν καὶ οἰνοῦσθαι παρακαλοῦντες ἀλλήλους· ὅταν δὲ κωλύη τι μείζον, ἀπογεύεσθαι γὰρ πάντως ἀκράτον νομίζοντες: but he has so many other statements in the same part of his works, concerning the Jews and their usages, which are false, that this may very probably be added to the number. Tertullian, Operum v. 45. Apologeticus, 16, implies, apparently, quite the reverse: Æque si diem solis lætitiæ indulgemus, alia longe ratione quam de religione solis, secundo loco ab eis sumus qui diem Saturni otio et victui decernunt, exorbitantes et ipsi a Judaico more, quem ignorant. Cf. Ibid. 154. ad Nationes, i. 13. It may be inferred, too, from the following passage of Persius, that the Jews in his time did not devote the sabbath to eating and drinking and making merry, but on the contrary to fasting and abstinence. At cum | Herodis ve-

nere dies, unctaque fenestra | Dispositæ pinguem nebulam vomuere lucernæ, | Portantes violas, rubrumque amplexa catinum | Cauda natat thynni, tumet alba fidelia vino: | Labra moves tacitus recutitaque sabbata palles. v. 179. It seems the most natural construction of these words, that the occurrence of a dies Herodis, (which being intended, as I suppose, of a day such as Agrippa the younger, the contemporary of Persius, would observe, may denote the sabbath,) at a period of rejoicing among the Romans, like the celebration of the Ludi Florales, or any thing of the same kind, would, under the influence of Jewish superstition, throw a damp over the festivity, as out of season upon one of their holy-days.

I know not, too, whether Horace, Sermonum ii. iii. 290, Illo | Mane die, quo tu indicis jejunia, in the supposed apostrophe to Jupiter, is not to be understood of the Jewish sabbath, rather than of the Dies Jovis. It is agreed, that the allusion is clearly to a piece of superstition, borrowed from the Jews by such of the Romans as observed it. And the passage cited from Suetonius in his Vita Augusti, proves that in Horace's time the sabbath was considered to be kept

^v Suetonius, Augustus, 76. Justin, xxxvi. 2.

is certain that they observed a comparative one; and in particular, that they would neither light a fire nor cook meat of any kind upon that day. Ἀπείρηται δὲ κατὰ ταύτην πῦρ ἐναύειν—Μηδὲ ὅτι θερμὸν πίνομεν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι δεινὸν ἡγεῖσθε—Καὶ ταῖς ἐβδομάσιν ἔργων ἐφάπτεσθαι διαφορώτατα Ἰουδαίων ἀπάντων (φυλάσσονται)· οὐ μόνον γὰρ τροφὰς ἑαυτοῖς πρὸς ἡμέρας μιᾶς παρασκευάζουσιν, ὡς μηδὲ πῦρ ἐναύοιεν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ σκευὴς τι μετακινῆσαι θαρρόουσιν, οὐδὲ ἀποπατεῖν^w.

On this account, at the first repast which followed upon the expiration of the sabbatic *νυχθήμερον*, that is, at the supper of the first evening of the ensuing week, they were accustomed, as was natural, to allow themselves in somewhat of more liberal an indulgence. The arrival of our Lord at Bethany was followed by a supper; which, if it was given on the evening of his arrival, was given on the evening in question; and otherwise it was manifestly such as to answer to this extraordinary character*. That it was so given will be seen hereafter, when we compare St. John's account of the unction with that of St. Matthew or of St. Mark. Moreover, it is a certain fact that the time of the mid-

by the Jews with the strictest abstinence from morning until sunset. We do not know this of Thursday, though the old Scholiast, *in locum*, asserts it. But this Scholiast is much later than the time of Horace. In a word, many of the customs ascribed to the Jews of this time, on the authority of the rabbis, in my opinion are falsely ascribed to them; and were not true at the Gospel period of their history. Of this number, I should consider the alleged observance of the sabbath-day as a feast, not

as a fast.

* Theophylact, i. 669. A. in Joannem xii. after observing that the lamb, designed for the Passover, was set apart on the tenth day of the month, and that preparations for the feast began to be made from that time forwards, continues: ἀμέλει καὶ τῇ πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν, ἣ ἐστὶν ἐννάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς, ἀβρότερον ἐστιῶνται, καὶ προοίμια τῆς ἑορτῆς τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην ποιοῦνται. According to the Jewish mode of reckoning, this would have been the evening of the Saturday before Passion-week.

^w Philo Judæus, *Operum* ii. 282. l. 45: De Septenario et Festis Diebus. Justin Martyr, 194. line 18. Jos. Bell. Jud. ii. viii. 9.

day's repast was one hour later on the sabbath than usual^x; and this is presumptively an argument that the time of the evening's on the same day was proportionably later also. Hence if its ordinary time on a week-day might be *before* sunset, its ordinary time on the sabbath-day might be *after*: if it was delayed, on a week-day, until the *first* hour of the night, or if the *first* hour of the night on a week day was its usual time, (which I believe to have been the case^y,) it would be nothing extraordinary that its time, on the sabbath, should have been the *second**.

* The evening's repast, even among the Romans, might be delayed until the time in question; for so it is that Augustus writes in the passage from his Life referred to above: Ne Judæus quidem, mî Tiberi, tam diligenter sabbatis jejunium servat, quam ego hodie servavi; qui in balneo demum, post horam primam noctis, duas buccas manducavi priusquam ungi inciperem: cap. 76. There is no proof that the Roman custom of supping at the ninth or tenth hour of the day was generally observed among the Jews: while the passage from the Life of Josephus, which shews him to have been supping, as matter of course, at the second hour of the night, seems to be decisive to the contrary. It may have been the case, however, that the ninth hour was the usual period of some meal among them; such as the evening's strictly so called, or what Calpurnius termed the *merenda*; but not their principal meal—as the supper is known to have been—and which

there is every reason to suppose was always taken in the night. It appears to have been their practice to make about four hours' interval between the time of one meal, and that of another; for the first was taken at πρωι, the next at the fifth hour of the day, the third at the ninth; and on the same principle the fourth, which would be properly the supper, would be taken at the *first* hour of the night. The *old* Roman custom also was to sup at sunset, or soon after it: and hence, probably, an ancient standing order of the Roman senate, alluded to by Seneca; Majores quoque nostri novam relationem post horam decimam in senatu fieri vetabant: De Tranquillitate, xv. §. 14. Varro, Fragmenta, Lib. iv. p. 195: Senatus consultum, ante exortum aut post occasum solem factum, ratum non fuit. Moreover, the fashionable Roman world was as much addicted to late hours, and as fond of turning day into night, and night into day, as the modern. L. Piso . . usque in horam sextam fere dormiebat—Jam lux pro-

^x Jos. Vita, 54.

^y Vide Jos. Vita, 44.

Again; though our Lord himself, and his Twelve Apostles, might stop with Zaccheus, there is no reason to suppose that the rest of his followers would do the same; and especially those who had homes of their

pius accedit: tempus est cœnæ—Prandia cœnis, usque in lucem perductis, ingesta sunt—Seneca, *Epistolæ*, 83. §. 12: 122. §. 7: *Naturalium Quæst.* iv. 13. §. 5. So it was in the time of Horace and Persius. Horace, *Sermonum* ii. vii. 32. Jusserit ad se | Mæcenas serum sub lumina prima venire | *Convivam*. *Epistolarum* i. v. 3. Supremo te sole domi, Torquate, manebo. Cf. *Sermonum* i. iii. 17. Tecum etenim longos memini consumere soles, | Et tecum primas epulis decerpere noctes. Persius, v. 41. Though the more usual supper or dinner hour at Rome, and where the Roman custom had been adopted, was not later than the *ninth* or *tenth*, that is, than three or four in the afternoon.

Procopius, *De Bello Persico*, i. 14. 71. l. 3–8, giving an account of a battle between the Romans, under Belisarius, in the reign of Justinian, A. D. 530 or 531, (see i. 17. 81. 14, 15,) and the Persians, under Mirrhanes, the general of Cabades, king of Persia, tells us the latter purposely delayed their attack until past midday: τοῦδε εἵνεκα ἐς τοῦτον τῆς ἡμέρας τὸν καιρὸν τὴν ξυμβολὴν ἀποθέμενοι, ὅτι δὴ αὐτοὶ μὲν σιτίοις ἐς δειλὴν ὀψίαν χρῆσθαι μόνον εἰώθασι, Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ πρὸ τῆς μεσημβρίας, ὥστε οὐποτε φόντο αὐτοὺς ὁμοίως ἀνθέξειν, ἣν πεινώσιν ἐπιθωνται. Cf. *Liber* ii. 18. p. 231. l. 4. Ἐς δειλὴν ὀψίαν cannot denote an earlier time than sunset; which it hence appears was the

common hour of supper throughout the East. The usage of the Jews, in respect to supping, would be no exception to this general rule. Such an usage at least was agreeable to that of the Greeks; who seem to have observed the same custom. *Ly-sias*, *Orato* i. §. 22: Σώστρατος ἦν μοι ἐπιτήδειος καὶ φίλος· τούτῳ ἡλίου δεδυκότος ἰόντι ἐξ ἀγροῦ ἀπήντησα· εἰδὼς δὲ ἐγὼ . . . ἐκέλευσα συνδειπνεῖν· καὶ ἐλθόντες οἴκαδε ὥς ἐμὲ ἀναβάντες εἰς τὸ ὑπερφῶν εἰδειπνοῦμεν. *Xenophon* *Hell.* vii. 2. 22: ἦν μὲν οὖν τῆς ὥρας μικρὸν πρὸ δυντὸς ἡλίου· κατελάμβανον δὲ τοὺς ἐν τῷ τείχει πολέμους τοὺς μὲν λουομένους, τοὺς δ' ὀψοποιουμένους, τοὺς δὲ φύροντας, τοὺς δὲ στιβάδας ποιουμένους. *Aulus Gellius*, xvii. 8: *Philosophus* *Taurus* accipiebat nos Athenis cœna plerumque ad id diei, ubi jam vesperaverat: id enim est tempus isthic cœnandi frequens. Cf. *Suidas*, *Δεκάπους σκιά*. Quæ quia principio posuit jejunia noctis, | Tempus habent mystæ sidera visa cibi. *Ovid*, *Fasti*, iv. 535. In the *Opera Inedita* of *Fronto*, vol. i. *De Feriis Alsiensibus*, vi. 197, we have this allusion in a letter of *Marcus Aurelius* to him: Dictatis his, legi Litteras Alsienses meo tempore, mi Magister, cum alii cenarent, ego cubarem tenui cibo contentus hora noctis secunda: whence it appears, that while *Marcus* was in bed, others were supping, at the second hour of the night.

own to go to, at no great distance from thence. For this reason, had the family of Lazarus accompanied him from Galilee to Jericho, and even been with him before he became the guest of Zaccheus; yet it would be morally certain that they would continue their route to Bethany, or that by some means or other they would arrive there before our Lord himself. Hence it might justly be said, as it is by St. John, that our Lord found Lazarus there when he came. Nor would it be extraordinary that a supper should be ready for him, *apparently* as soon as he came; for they might be expecting his arrival, and already apprised of the time when it would take place.

It would seem then that the day when Jesus crossed the Jordan, and passed through Jericho, and subsequently stopped with Zaccheus, was Friday, the seventh of the Jewish Nisan, and the twenty-ninth of the Julian March; that the day when he arrived at Bethany was Saturday the thirtieth of the Julian March, and strictly speaking the evening of the ninth of the Jewish Nisan. From this point of time then must we begin to deduce the train of proceedings subsequently, until the morning of the resurrection; and it is a strong argument of the truth of these conclusions, that the duration of what was literally the period of our Lord's suffering becomes, upon this principle, agreeably to its name of Passion-week, neither more nor less than one week. For he thus arrived at Bethany on the first day of one week, and he rose again on the first day of the next: and as the former of these extremes was strictly the beginning, so was the latter the close of the period of his humiliation, or of what St. John calls *κατ' ἐξοχὴν* his *hour*; and the close of the period of his humiliation was also the beginning of his glorification.

This question being thus disposed of, we may proceed to consider the course of events from the date of the arrival at Bethany to the time of the procession to Jerusalem.

The first of these events is the supper and the unction which followed so soon upon the arrival; but this has been reserved for discussion elsewhere. The next is the resort of the Jews to Bethany^z, to see Jesus and Lazarus, who was also there; a resort, which could not be prior to his arrival, and was doubtless produced by the news of the arrival itself. Yet it could not have begun on the day of that arrival; first, because the arrival, as we have proved, was either on the sabbath, or one hour after its close. If it was upon the sabbath, then Bethany, which was fifteen stades or one Roman mile and seven eighths of another distant from Jerusalem^a, was three times the distance allowed to be travelled on the sabbath; viz. two thousand cubits, five or six stades. This distance St. Luke tells us was about the distance of Mount Olivet from the city^b—that is, according to Josephus^c, not more than six, nor less than five stades. Οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς . . . ψυχρὰς παραδόσεις φέροντες, ὥσπερ καὶ περὶ τοῦ σαββάτου φάσκοντες τόπον ἐκάστω εἶναι δισχιλίους πηχεῖς—Οὐκ ἐξῆν βαδίζειν ἐν σάββασιν ὑπὲρ τὸ μέτρον τῶν ἐξ σταδίων τῶν ὀρισμένων—Si quando eos juxta litteram cœperimus arctare: ut non jaceant, non ambulent, non stent, sed tantum sedeant (sc. sabbato)... solent respondere et dicere, Barachibas, et Simeon et Helles, magistri nostri, tradiderunt nobis ut bis mille pedes ambulemus in sabbatho^d.

^z John xii. 9—11.

^a John xi. 18. Origen, iv. 140. B. in Joannem, Tom. vi. 24. Hieronymus, ii. Pars i^a. 422. De Situ et Nominibus.

^b Acts i. 12.

^c Bell. Jud. v. ii. 3. Ant. xx. viii. 6.

^d Origen, De Principiis, iv. 17. Operum i. 176. Epiphanius, Operum i. 702. C. Manichæi lxxxii. Hieronymus, Operum iv. Pars i^a. 207. *ad medium*. Vide also, Mishna, ii. 240. 4. iii. 248. 3. Vide Josh. iii. 4. Numb. xxxv. 5.

But if it took place after the sabbath, neither could the news of the arrival have been carried that night to the city, nor if it had would there have been time for any resort to Bethany to begin the same evening. At the vernal equinox, it would be dark soon after the close of the first hour of the night. Besides which, what stranger would have thought of intruding upon Jesus, or Lazarus, for the gratification of his own curiosity, before the following morning ?

It may be taken for granted, then, that the time of the resort belongs, at the earliest, to the ensuing day ; the morning of the ninth of Nisan, Sunday in Passion-week, and the thirty-first of the Julian March : a conclusion, which the interposed account of the supper, if that be regular, demonstrates beyond a question. If the resort was *after* that supper, it must have been *on* the ninth of Nisan.

All this day, Jesus continued in Bethany ; and if we consider the proximity of that village to Jerusalem, the preexisting impatience of the people to see our Lord^e, and the prodigious numbers, which in addition to its own population, were always present in Jerusalem at the time of the Passover, we shall not doubt that this passing to and fro would quickly begin, and when begun would go on with such bustle and celebrity as to attract the notice of the Sanhedrim, whose eyes all along had been fixed on Jesus ; and as being produced in part by the desire of seeing Lazarus, the living witness to his own resurrection, would speedily induce them to deliberate on the best mode of removing him also. The probable absence of Lazarus from Jerusalem until now, which fact we have endeavoured to establish elsewhere, is a sufficient reason why this resolution should not have been conceived before ; and his return at this time in

^e John xi. 55, 56.

company with Jesus, followed by the curiosity which his presence excited, as naturally accounts for it now. The sensible proof of so stupendous a miracle, furnished by his personal reappearance on the spot, made as many converts as the preaching of our Lord himself.

It will follow from this conclusion that the day of the actual procession to the temple, which John xii. 12 denominates τὴν ἐπαύριον, the day after this resort, must have been the *second* day of the week, the Jewish tenth of Nisan, and the Julian first of April. If so, this procession is erroneously assigned to the Sunday in Passion week, thence commonly called Palm Sunday ; and does in reality belong to the Monday. The contrary opinion however general, rests upon no better authority than that of prescription ; and if there seems reason to do so, we may freely call it into question : for however much we may be inclined to respect the concurrence of opinion, and the length of time for which such and such notions have been in vogue, we are bound to subscribe to none, even the most ancient and most popular, merely because they are so. These opinions were fixed originally in times when those, who determined them, had not the inclination, and perhaps not the ability, to be particularly careful in ascertaining their truth : and since then they have been received and transmitted with an implicit deference to antiquity and to authority : as if what had so long been currently believed could not possibly be mistaken.

Upon the question at issue, while the arrangement and succession of events in St. John, dated from their proper ἀρχή, the time of the arrival at Bethany, necessarily lead us *up* to this one conclusion ; the testimony of the other Evangelists, deduced from the date of the

last supper, would reflexively confirm St. John, and necessarily lead us *back* to it. If it can be proved that this supper took place on the Thursday, then they bring down the course of events to the close of the day before it, which is Wednesday; and prior to this they give clear intimations of *two*, but only of *two*, successive days more: the first of which was the day of the procession to the temple. The day of this procession, if it was two days prior to the Wednesday, must have coincided with the Monday.

A further argument, and perhaps the most powerful of all, will appear hereafter from the end and design of the procession itself. Nor can it be any good objection to the conclusion in question, that it supposes our Lord to have continued one entire day at Bethany, apparently inactive, before he appeared in public. I have no doubt that, for the sake of the reason alluded to, this was done on purpose. Under the circumstances of his appearance on this occasion, no day was proper for his first solemn reappearance in public, except the tenth of Nisan. In the mean time, his continuance at Bethany, by affording an opportunity for a more promiscuous resort of the people to him, and by diffusing a greater and more general expectation of his coming, was preparatory to his reappearing at last with so much the more of publicity. Not to say that wherever he was he could not be inactive; and if he did not teach in the temple, he might still be so employed at Bethany. One part of a day, at least, and that the greater part, must have been on any principle occupied in private; for if, as St. Mark tells us, he did not arrive in the temple until late, he could not have set out to go thither until late.

There is a much greater objection which may be brought against the received opinion; viz. that if we compute the detail of proceedings in Passion-week from

Palm Sunday we must bring our Lord's public ministry, as we shall see hereafter, to its close on the Tuesday; and one whole day, the Wednesday ensuing, before the celebration of the last supper, would become a total blank; during which it would be evident that our Lord could not have been any way engaged in public, and yet we should not be able to conjecture how he might be engaged in private. The way to obviate this difficulty is to date these proceedings from Monday: for then every day (even the Sunday not excepted) is accounted for, down to the eve of Thursday; at which time our Lord solemnly made an end of his ministry. On the Thursday he kept his Passover; and on the Friday he suffered.

Now the connection between all these events is such that, if any one of them only was fixed to a certain day, the rest must have been similarly determined. For example; if Jesus was to suffer on the Friday, he must keep his own Passover on the Thursday; he could not both keep it himself, and fulfil it by suffering upon the feast day, at the same time. And if he was to keep his own Passover on the Thursday, he must take leave of the people, and formally close his ministry, on the Wednesday; he could not both be employed on the next day, as he had been for the two days before, and keeping his Passover also. Nor is it improbable that the *three* days, thus spent in public, from Monday in Passion-week, to Wednesday inclusive, during which he was conversant in the temple before his enemies as well as his friends, contained a secret reference to the *three* years of his ministry previously. Each, reckoned on the principle of the Jewish computation, would terminate alike the day before he consummated the final purpose of his mission itself; viz. on the thirteenth of the Jewish Nisan. For he proceeded to the temple on Monday, and he finally quitted it on the Wednesday;

upon the morning of the Jewish tenth of Nisan in the one case, and on the evening of the Jewish thirteenth in the other. We may observe also this further analogy between these three days, and the three years of the Christian ministry. On the first our Lord went to the temple amidst the acclamations of the people, and welcomed by all as their Messiah: on the second he was received with ambiguous favour, and minds wavering between faith and unbelief: on the third this feeling was still more increased; and at the close of that day his enemies, as we shall see hereafter, concerted with Judas the scheme of his death. The same description of the effect, *mutatis mutandis*, might apply to the three years of his ministry. But to proceed with the course of the subject.

The Gospel of St. John, which has hitherto gone by itself, it is manifest still stands alone from xii. 12 to 13, where the proceedings of Monday, the tenth of Nisan and the first of April, begin to be related. The fact of the resort from Jerusalem to Bethany, produced by the news that our Lord was coming to the city, and the special circumstance that his procession set out from Bethany, are peculiar to his account. Bethphage, indeed, through which the three other Evangelists all make it pass, lay upon the slope of Mount Olivet^f, as well as Bethany; and nearer to Jerusalem than it; in which case, a procession from Bethany towards Jerusalem would pass through or by Bethphage.

The reason however why Bethphage, in St. Mark and in St. Luke, is placed before Bethany is probably this; that as, according to Epiphanius^g, φύσει (γὰρ) λεωφόρος ἦν παλαιά, the high road from Jericho, ἄγουσα εἰς Ἱερουσα-

^f Hieronymus, ii. Pars i^a. 422. De Situ et Nominibus. ^g Operum i. 340. D.
341. A. Marcionistæ. 2 Sam. xv. 23. 30. xvii. 22.

λήμ διὰ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, οὐκ ἄγνωστος οὕσα τοῖς καὶ τὸν τόπον ἱστοροῦσιν—Bethphage lay upon the direct line of this route, but Bethany did not; so that one travelling from Jericho, as they suppose our Lord to be travelling previously, would come to Bethphage first, and would have to turn off from the road to go to Bethany. It is possible also that they were almost contiguous; or little more than divisions of the same village: and in any case, it is certain that our Lord's procession stopped at Bethphage; and from thence that he continued his route under those circumstances which, as being the most illustrious instance of the fulfilment of prophecy now supplied, all the Evangelists are more or less careful to record.

From this time forward St. John's account begins to be joined by that of the rest; and as might be expected in a supplementary Gospel, he dwells henceforth upon nothing but what they had passed over in comparative silence; or what was necessary to explain them, and to apply his own accounts to their's. Of his conciseness where he touches upon a circumstance which had been fully related before, xii. 14 is an apposite proof; and of the application of his accounts to their's, xii. 16 and 17. The miracle of Lazarus indeed, as one of the most recent, and certainly one of the most memorable instances of *power* which the disciples had witnessed, must undoubtedly have been alluded to, Luke xix. 37: but the propriety of the allusion in St. Luke appears only from St. John.

The news of our Lord's intention to visit Jerusalem, on this day, was probably carried thither by some of the many visitors to Bethany the same morning. The consequent procession of the Jews from the country^h, which set out from the city to meet him, must have set

^h John xii. 12.

out of their own accord ; and perhaps joined him first when he was still at Bethphage. The Hosannas then, which John xii. 13 ascribes to the attendants of Jesus, are manifestly the Hosannas of the *whole* of his attendants ; and not, like those in the other Evangelists, the Hosannas of a *part*. The branches of palm, a species of tree which is among the first in the East to put forth its verdure, were carried for a purpose left unexplained by St. John, but ascertained by the rest—viz. to strew in the road before Jesus ; a mark of respect, which would be paid to none but persons of acknowledged rank and dignityⁱ—in unison, consequently, with the strong expectation now entertained that the kingdom of the Messiah was at hand ; and with the personal Hosannas, addressed to our Lord as King. There is a case in point to the demonstrations of joy upon this occasion, and about the same time of the year also, 1 Maccabees xiii. 51. The use of these boughs in particular was associated also with the ceremonial of the most festive and gladsome among the Jewish solemnities, the Scenopegia or feast of Tabernacles^k. Similar to these acts in design, but a still more striking declaration of the personal feelings of the agents, (not, however, until our Lord had mounted upon the ass's colt, and resumed his procession with something of the state of a King, as well as with the humility of a Prophet,) was the act, ascribed by the rest of the Evangelists to the greater part of the multitude present, the act of spreading their garments on the ground beneath his feet ; for this was directly to acknowledge him as king *^l.

* It is thus that Clytemnestra, according to Æschylus, receives Agamemnon upon his return from Troy. Δμωαί, τί μέλλεθ', αἷς ἐπέ-

ⁱ Vide Herodotus, vii. 54. Compare also viii. 99. ^k Nehem. viii. 15. Ant. Jud. xiii. xiii. 5. Maimonides, De Sacrificiis Jugibus, x. 8. Annot. ^l Ant. Jud. ix. vi. 2. 2 Kings ix. 13.

Between Bethphage and Jerusalem, on the same slope of Mount Olivet, though not necessarily in the same line of descent, there must have lain another village; a circumstance by no means improbable; for the suburbs of Jerusalem were scattered with villages in every direction. To this village were the two disciples despatched from Bethphage for the ass and the colt, upon which Jesus designed to enter Jerusalem. Though their names are not mentioned, yet we may conjecture that these two were Peter and John; and in order to point out the fulfilment of a remarkable prediction, the fact of their mission is specified by each of the three Evangelists. The account of St. Mark, however, is much the most particular; which, if Peter was one of the messengers, would be easily explained; and next to St. Mark's, St. Luke's. But St. Matthew, with his usual attention to this kind of argument, has noticed the most distinctly of any the conformity of the event to the prediction of it by Zechariah ^m.

Nor is there any difference in the terms of the several accounts, further than what concerns the precise statement of the orders given to the messengers; in which St. Matthew comprehends both a she-ass and her colt; St. Mark and St. Luke, though by mentioning a colt as such they virtually include also its dam, yet specify only the colt. The true reason of which distinction is not that both were not sent for, but that our Lord, though

σταλται τέλος | πέδον κεύθου
στρωννύναι πετάσμασιν; | εὐθὺς γε-
νέσθω πορφυρόστρωτος πόρος, | εἰς
δῶμ' ἀελπτον ὡς ἂν ἡγήται δίκη.
Agamemnon, 917. Qua ventura
Dea est, juvenes timidæque pu-
ellæ | Prævertunt latas veste ja-
cente vias. Ovid, Amores, iii.

xiii. 23.

Plutarch, Cato Minor, 12: ὑ-
ποτιθέντων τὰ ἱμάτια τοῖς ποσὶν ἢ
βαδίζοι. Charito, Lib. iii. 44. line
24: ἡ Ἀφροδίτη γαμεῖ. πορφυρίδας
ὑπεστρώννον, καὶ ῥόδα καὶ ἄλ' μύρον
ἐρραῖνον βαδίζούσης.

he sent for the dam also, intended to ride solely on the colt, and actually rode only on the colt.

The first of these facts is implied in the very terms of the order relating to the colt, as recorded by St. Mark and by St. Luke, though omitted by St. Matthew—ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισενⁿ. This circumstance would not have been so distinctly specified, if our Lord had not himself intended to sit upon it *now* for the first time: and the fulfilment of the prophecy, which had predicted in the first place his riding upon an ass, and in the next, to shew that it was an ass as yet unbroken or put to any common use, on a *colt*, the *foal* of an ass, was rendered thereby so much the more striking. The second of the same facts is proved directly by the testimony of St. Mark and of St. Luke, who both affirm that he rode upon the colt; and implicitly by that of St. John; whose use of the term ὀνάριον^o shews that the animal was a young one of its kind.

It was not possible that Jesus could ride on both the dam and her colt at once; nor probable that he would ride first upon the one and then upon the other*. When therefore St. Matthew says that the disciples, having brought the ass and her colt, put their own robes, ἐπάνω αὐτῶν^p, this may be explained by the simple consideration that, as both had been sent for, they might think both were wanted, or as yet they did not know which Jesus designed to use. Or, like Matthew xxvii. 44, or Herodotus ii. 121, §. 4, (ἐπιθέντα δὲ τὸν νέκυν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὄνους,) it may be resolved into the mere compendium of speech. But when he adds, καὶ ἐπεκάθισεν (ὁ Ἰησοῦς) ἐπάνω αὐτῶν, no one can doubt that he

* Yet this has been supposed: Vide Theophylact, i. 109. C. In Matt. xxi.

ⁿ Luke xix. 30. Cf. Mark xi. 21

^o Ch. xii. 14.

^p Ch. xxi. 7.

means this to be understood of his sitting *on the garments*, which served as the *ephippia* or housings for the occasion. In the first three Evangelists the act in question is distinctly attributed to the disciples; and even in the last it is so implicitly^q: Now these things the disciples understood not at the first—but when Jesus was glorified, then they remembered that these things had been written in allusion to him, and these things they had done for him. The observation is intended of the personal agency of the disciples in bringing them to pass. The presence of the ass then, as well as of her colt, may perhaps be accounted for by supposing that, if the colt was still a young one and following the dam, it could not be separated from it; or rather because the female or mother ass being mentioned in the prophecy, the female or mother ass was concerned also in the fulfilment of it. The colt could not be distinctly recognised for such, except by means of its relation to the dam. Nor is it improbable that, while Jesus himself rode on the one, something belonging to him—perhaps his upper or outer garment—might be carried on the other.

In this state would he set out from Bethphage towards the city: nor could he have proceeded far before the enthusiasm of his attendants broke out into Hosannas and Hallelujahs; and St. Luke seems to have critically pointed out both the place where they began to be raised, and the quarter from which they first proceeded. The place was the foot, or as he calls it the *κατάβασις* *, of the Mount of Olives, when the

* Xenophon, Anab. iii. iv. 37: ἀκρωνυχίαν ὄρους, ὑφ' ἣν ἡ κατάβασις ἦν εἰς τὸ πεδίου. Suidas, Ἀκρώρεια. εἰς τρία γὰρ διήρητο τὸ ὄρος· εἰς ἀκρώρειαν, εἰς ὑπώρειαν, εἰς τέρμα. ἀκρώρεια μὲν ἐστὶν ἡ κο-

ρυφή. ὑπώρεια δὲ τὰ πλευρὰ τοῦ ὄρους. τέρμα δὲ τὰ τελευταία, καὶ πόδες. The same gloss occurs again, voce Τέρμα and Ὑπώρεια. So likewise Hesychius.

^q John xii. 16.

procession would still be five or six stades distant from the city, and had not yet crossed the valley and brook of Cedron^r, which bounded the mountain at its base. The quarter, from which they proceeded, was our Lord's own disciples; and Hosannas or Hallelujahs, raised upon the grounds which are specified Luke xix. 37, could have begun with none so fitly as with them. Both the fact of their commencement in this quarter, and the propriety with which they had begun there, are illustrated by the remonstrance arising out of the one, and by the answer which vindicated the other^s. Such a rebuke would hardly have been levelled against them in particular, if they were following the example of others, and not setting an example to the rest themselves. St. John indeed shews that this example was speedily imitated, especially by those who had seen, and who still remembered the raising of Lazarus; so that John xii. 17, 18 will ensue on Luke xix. 37, 38, and then the remonstrance of the Pharisees, with its answer, Luke xix. 39, 40, upon that.

It is in the nature of enthusiastic emotions to be rapidly propagated among large bodies. The acclamations of the disciples therefore were soon caught and reechoed by the multitudes, according to St. Matthew and St. Mark, who went before and who followed after: and the difference, if there is any, in their several Hosannas may consequently be accounted for thus. In St. Luke, these are the acclamations of the immediate followers of Jesus; in St. Matthew and in St. Mark (nearly agreeing together) they are the acclamations of the promiscuous multitude, distinct from them. The strain indeed of all might be very much alike; though, for the sake of his Gentile readers, St. Luke would purposely omit such expressions as

^r Reland, *Palæstina*, i. xlv. 294. liv. 351.

^s Luke xix. 39, 40.

Hosanna ; Hosanna, for the Son of David ; the kingdom of our father David ; and the like ; which were intelligible only to Jews, or resolvable into Jewish prepossessions.

Subsequently to the commencement of these acclamations, but before our Lord was arrived at Jerusalem—probably while he was still on the mount of Olives, with the city and the temple to the westward in view before his eyes—the affecting scene of his weeping over it, accompanied by the most lively, minute, and circumstantial prediction of its siege and desolation, any where in Scripture, must have taken place^t : the contrast between which, rendered more impressive as it was by his own significant emotion, and the false enthusiasm of the surrounding multitude, is too remarkable to escape our notice. Yet could it not have damped the ardour of the spectators ; nor therefore have been rightly comprehended by them at the time ; for the same demonstrations of joy and exultation, which had attended Jesus to Jerusalem, accompanied him also into it.

The whole city, as St. Matthew next observes, was shaken or agitated ; agitated, by the bustle and ferment of so large a procession, by the joint acclamations of the multitude and of the disciples, and by the natural impulse of curiosity to know what this could mean. As is usual under such circumstances, the train of our Lord would acquire accessions of numbers the further it proceeded ; and in his progress to the temple, the crowded streets of Jerusalem, where millions of souls at this time were collected in attendance upon the feast, would swell prodigiously the concourse of his followers. Here then we may best insert that observation of the Pharisees among themselves, John xii.

^t Luke xix. 41—44.

19, not merely as a consequence of the failure of their previous remonstrance, but as a distinct admission of their own inability to arrest the tide of the popular feeling; which is most naturally accounted for by supposing that feeling to be now arrived at its height. From the place assigned to it in the context, it could not long have preceded the request of the Hellenes to see Jesus; as neither did that request the departure of Jesus for the night. But this brings us to the consideration of the time when our Lord entered the temple, and what stay he may be supposed to have made there.

That we may waive, for the present, the further question whether he cleansed the court of the temple on this occasion or not; (a question, which has nothing to do with the first of those two points, and but little with the second;) St. Mark's account of proceedings, after the entrance into the city, is simply this—that our Lord went into the temple; looked round on the state of things there; and then departed with the Twelve to Bethany for the night. And it is assigned, as the reason for the shortness of his stay, that the hour was late. St. Luke, who mentions merely the cleansing of the temple, leaves every other circumstance doubtful; except that, by telling us elsewhere^u that our Lord's practice, throughout the previous days, had been not to leave the temple until night, he may be considered to imply that he left it, on this occasion also, only at night. St. Matthew's account adds certain particulars to that of St. Mark; viz. the cure of some blind and lame persons in the temple; the acclamations of the children; and another remonstrance of the Pharisees, with our Lord, on that account: in none of which is there any thing inconsistent with St. Mark.

For first, the περιβλεψάμενος πάντα of this Evan-

^u Ch. xxi. 37.

gelist^v does not imply that Jesus did nothing else on this occasion; but simply prepares the reader for the cleansing of the temple on the following day. Secondly, the cures in question, though necessarily wrought after the entrance into the temple, would take up no time, nor require any long continuance there. Thirdly, the acclamations of the children had doubtless been going on from the first, and were not then merely begun, so as to have produced the remonstrance on the spot. Fourthly, as soon as our Lord had replied to this remonstrance, he left the temple immediately; and when he went out it was for the night; for he proceeded to Bethany, and slept there.

The account of St. John, so far as it belongs to the history of proceedings on the same day, consists of only one additional and supplementary particular, the request of the Hellenes to see Jesus, and the reflections which it drew from our Lord^w. If these Hellenes were, as I apprehend, and as their name implies, not Jews of the Dispersion, whose proper denomination would have been Hellenists, but Gentile proselytes, numbers of whom attended every feast^x; the scene of this incident, or at least of the first part of it, the request addressed to Philip, was probably the outer court of the temple, to which only such proselytes had access; and therefore the time was either when our Lord was passing through that court out of the temple, or after he had already quitted it: and there is internal evidence, at verses 35 and 36, that, as this application to him was apparently the last event in the day, so it was made when the night was at hand. The allusion at least in those verses to the approach of *the*

^v Ch. xi. 11.^w Ch. xii. 20—36.^x Jos. Bell. vi. ix. 3.

night, besides its spiritual meaning, becomes so much the more striking and impressive, if it contains a sensible meaning also.

The *nation* of the inquirers is further implied by the nature of their request itself; which was much more probably that they might be permitted to speak with, than merely to see Jesus. If they were really Gentiles, the former would be such a request as neither Philip nor Andrew, without first consulting his Master, could take upon himself to grant; and therefore it would account at once for the behaviour of both: but the latter was such a gratification of an innocent curiosity, as any one of the disciples might voluntarily have undertaken to concede. The strain of our Lord's reflections is in unison with the same supposition; for he takes occasion, from the coincidence of such a request at this time, to predict in obscure, yet significant terms the future success of his Gospel, in the preaching of Christ crucified among the Gentiles. When this conversation then took place, it is probable that he was either passing out of the temple, or had quitted it already. Nor is more implied at verses 28 and 29, by the mention of the people's standing and hearing the voice from heaven, than that, on being apprised of the application of these strangers, wheresoever he was, he had stopped for a time (which however could not be long) to deliver the sentiments which ensued.

Laying these particulars together with St. Mark's previous statement of the time when he left the temple—a statement, which cannot be understood of an earlier period than sunset—and making every allowance for the slowness and solemnity of the procession, after it set out from Bethany to traverse a distance which probably did not exceed three Roman miles in extent; we may come to the conclusion that Jesus must have

left Bethany about the ninth hour on the tenth of Nisan, Monday in Passion-week, and the Julian first of April; that he must have arrived in the temple before the eleventh hour; and must have left it again before sunset, or just on the eve of the Jewish eleventh of Nisan.

It would seem, then, that upon this occasion he must barely as it were have appeared in the temple, and as speedily departed from it again; which would be so far simply to present himself before God: and if the Christian doctrine of the Atonement is scriptural and true, to present himself in his capacity of the Paschal sacrifice, now ready to be offered up. If we may assume then, that he did this in compliance with the legal equity; the legal equity required it to be done on the tenth of Nisan: for at the first institution of the Passover^y, it had been commanded that the lamb, which was to be sacrificed on the fourteenth, should be taken up and consecrated for that purpose on the tenth. It is true that Maimonides, and others of the rabbis, enumerate this requisition among the *special* circumstances, such as eating the Passover in haste, in the garb and attitude of travellers, and the like, which they consider peculiar to the Pascha Ægyptium, or the first Passover as such. Quod autem in Ægypto præscriptum erat, ut usque a decimo die primi mensis pararetur victima paschalis, . . . hæc omnia omnino semel in illo sacro paschali Ægyptio servata sunt; sed nunquam usitata fuere postmodum^z. I am ready to admit the general probability of this statement, especially in the case of those who might arrive in Jerusalem on the morning of the Passover itself; of which we shall see an instance hereafter in the case of Simon of Cyrene. But if it was merely a circumstance essential to the

^y Exod. xii. 3. 6.

^z De Sacrificio Paschali, x. 15.

ceremonial of the *first* Passover, that was sufficient to make it indispensable to the sacrifice of the death of Christ; and to explain the grounds of the legal requisition, which would otherwise be inexplicable.

But in addition to the character of the Paschal victim, our Lord had another to support, in the character of the daily sacrifice: with regard to which Maimonides himself informs us^a that the lambs, intended for that purpose, were set apart to be kept in the Conclave Agnorum, within the sanctuary, *quatriduum* ante immolationem. On this principle the daily sacrifice, for the fourteenth of Nisan, must have been taken up and set apart on the tenth; the morning sacrifice in the morning, the evening one in the evening. On the same principle too, it would be nothing improbable to suppose that every lamb, which was wanted by any Paschal company on the fourteenth of Nisan, was set apart in some proper place, for the service of such a company, on the tenth. In all these coincidences, if our Saviour was really the true Paschal victim, and really the true ἐνδελχὴς θυσία, and really presented himself in both these capacities before God, on the tenth of Nisan, four days before the fourteenth when he suffered, and about the same time of the day on the one, at which he suffered upon the other; we cannot but perceive a striking conformity between the type and the antitype, between the figures of things to come, and their fulfilment by the event: which correspondence, it would be great scepticism and incredulity, if not the height of inconsistency, to resolve into the effect of chance. It will add to the difficulty of accounting for it on any principle but that of design; that the tenth of Nisan, when our Lord presented himself in the temple, according to the Jewish mode of reckoning, was his *no-*

^a De Sacrificiis Jugibus, i. 8.

minimal birthday, and the fourteenth of Nisan when he actually suffered, according to the Julian, was his *true*: that is to say, the fifth of the Julian April, which coincided in the year of his birth with the tenth of Nisan, coincided in this year when he suffered with the fourteenth. For the proof of these positions I must refer to my first volume^b; but if the positions themselves are true, we need no other argument to convince us that the day of our Lord's procession to the temple before he suffered was Monday, the first of April, which coincided with the tenth of Nisan; as the day when he suffered was Friday, the fifth of April, which coincided with the fourteenth.

^b Vide Dissertation xii.

DISSERTATION XXXIX.

On the proceedings of Tuesday in Passion-week, and on the time of the cleansing of the Temple.

THE transactions of this day, which answers to the eleventh of the Jewish Nisan and the second of the Julian April, as far as they have been recorded, are only these three; first, the cursing of the barren fig-tree, before the arrival of our Lord at the temple; secondly, the cleansing or purgation of the temple; and thirdly, the day's teaching in it afterwards. On the last of these points there is no difficulty; but upon each of the former there is. We will consider them in the order of their occurrence.

The malediction pronounced upon the fig-tree, is related by St. Matthew and by St. Mark; but for a reason which might easily be assigned*, is omitted by St. Luke; and both the former place it on the day after the procession to the temple, as our Lord with his disciples was returning thither from Bethany again. The scene of the malediction is consequently ascertained to be somewhere between Bethany and the city, on the mount of Olives; and the time, which St. Mark's expression, *τῇ ἐπαύριον*^a, would have left indefinite, becomes similarly determined by St. Matthew's^b, *πρωίας δὲ ἐπανάγων εἰς τὴν πόλιν*, to a period very probably prior, and certainly not posterior to the

* This reason is the affinity and connexion between the final end of the act of striking the barren fig-tree, and the moral of

the parable of the fig-tree planted in the vineyard, which St. Luke has recorded.

^a Mark xi. 12.

^b Matt. xxi. 18.

first hour of the day. $\Pi\rho\omega\acute{\iota}$ and $\pi\rho\omega\acute{\iota}\alpha$, however nearly akin, are not exactly the same in their signification; and as the former properly implies the *first* hour of the day, which began at sunrise, so does the latter the time immediately prior to that, which is the interval between dawn and sunrise. The same hour was the period of the usual morning's meal among the Jews; in which case, the hunger of our Lord—which is specified by each of the Evangelists, independently of any other considerations, as the moving cause to the act in question—becomes naturally accounted for*. And that the return to the temple both this morning and the next was early, may be collected from the general declaration of St. Luke quoted above^c; as well as from John viii. 2, which shews it was our Saviour's practice, whenever he repaired to the temple, to go thither early. The hour of $\pi\rho\omega\acute{\iota}$, indeed, was the commencement of the morning service; and from that time to the third hour of the day was one of the stated periods for the resort of the people to worship. It is no wonder, then, that our Lord should be in the temple during these times more particularly.

The final end of striking the fig-tree, which was a symbolical action, and more closely connected with the scope and design of the parable recorded Luke xiii. 6–9 than is commonly supposed, I cannot now undertake to explain; but whatever other difficulties, in relation to the material fact there might be—as why the tree, by exhibiting a show of leaves, should have raised the expectation of fruit, and yet the time or

* According to Mr. Harmer, (iii. 126, 127. ch. iv. Obs. xxxix.) the people of the East still eat as soon as they get up, break-

fasting on eggs, cheese, honey, &c., bread, milk, fruit. And their practice is to rise at break of day, all the year round.

^c Ch. xxi. 37, 38.

season of the fruit not yet be come^d—it may be proper, and it is not difficult, to obviate.

The natural period for the principal crop of the fig is every where the same, the close of the summer or the beginning of autumn; and that is consequently the proper season of figs. But it is known to naturalists that, in its own country, the fig-tree produces a second crop, the season of which is the winter. It might be some of this second crop which our Lord expected to find on this occasion: and in that case, it must have been of the remnant of the fruit of the former year. But it is also possible that it might be fruit actually of that year's growth. *Ficus et præcoces habet*, says Pliny, *quas Athenis prodromos vocant*^e. *Sunt et biferæ in eisdem*^f. And again: *Contra novissima sub hieme maturatur chelidonia. sunt præterea eadem serotinae et præcoces, biferæ, alba ac nigra, cum messe, vindemiaque, maturescentes* * ^g. According to Maimonides,

* Athenæus, iii. 7; ex Epi-
gene: εἴτ' ἔρχεται | χελιδονείων μετ'
ὀλίγον σκληρῶν ἀδρός | πινακίσκος.
These figs, like certain winds,
were probably so called because
they appeared with the swallow.

Ibid. 11: τὰ δὲ χειμερινὰ σύκα
Πάμφιλος καλεῖσθαι φησι Κυδωναῖα
ὑπὸ Ἀχαιῶν. Of the early ripe
figs, called πρόδρομοι, the same
author (12) quotes from Theo-
phrastus: πάλιν δὲ τοὺς προδρό-
μους αἱ μὲν φέρουσιν, ἥ τε Λακω-
νική...καὶ ἕτεραι πλείους· αἱ δ' οὐ φέ-
ρουσιν. Again: Σέλευκος δ' ἐν Γλώσ-
σαις, προτερικὴν φησι καλεῖσθαι γέ-
νος τι συκῆς, ἥτις φέρει πρόϊον τὸν
καρπὸν. διφόρου δὲ συκῆς μνημο-
νεύει καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Ἐκκλησια-
ζούσαις· ὑμᾶς δὲ τέως θρία λαβόν-
τας | διφόρου συκῆς. καὶ Ἀντιφά-

νης, ἐν Σκληρίαις· ἔστι δὲ παρ' αὐτὴν
τὴν δίφορον συκὴν κάτω. Hierony-
mus, iii. 644. *ad calc.* in Jerem.
25: Comparat autem calathum,
qui bonas ficus habebat, et bonas
nimis, ficis primi temporis, quæ
Græce appellantur πρώϊμα.

In Ovid's *Fasti*, ii. 253, there
is a legendary story relating to
the constellation Anguis, Avis,
Crater, the time of whose rising
was xvi Kal. Martias. Stabat
adhuc duris ficus densissima po-
mis: | Tentat eam rostro; non
erat apta legi. | Immemor impe-
rii sedisse sub arbore fertur, |
Dum fierent tarda dulcia poma
mora. On which principle, there
must have been a possibility of
meeting with *green* figs, in a con-
siderable state of forwardness,

^d Mark xi. 13.

^e H. N. xvi. 49.

^f Ibid. l.

^g H. N. xv. 19.

the fruits of certain trees were required to be offered along with the *δράγμα*, *manipulus*, or wave-sheaf of barley at the Passover: which implies that, generally speaking, ripe fruits were to be had at that season as well as ripe barley. If this was likely to be the case

so early even as February 14. Cf. Hyginus, *Poeticum Astro-nomicon*, i. 40. *Scholia ad Arati Phænomena*, 449, and ad *Germanici Aratea Phænomena*, 426.

The physical history of these early ripe figs is thus detailed by Hilary of Poitiers, in *Matt. Canon* xxi. *Operum* 570. A—D.

Hæc namque arbor dissimiliter a ceterarum arborum et natura et conditione florescit. nam flos ei primus in pomis est, sed non his, quæ maturitatem, ut emergerint, consequentur. grossa enim hæc et communis usus et prophetica autoritas nuncupavit. verum postea internæ fecunditatis virtute exuberante, ejusdem speciei atque formæ poma prorumpunt: quibus prorumpentibus ista truduntur, et dissolutis quibus continebantur radicibus, decidunt (*ita leg.*) aliaque illa exeuntia usque ad maturitatem fructuum provehuntur. sed de superioribus illis, si quando inciderit ut in sinu virgularum ex ramulo eodem prodeuntium emergerint, manent semper, et non sicut grossa cetera decidunt, sed hærent sola tantum poma quæ cetera maturitate præveniunt. et hos pulcherrimos fructus arbor illa ex se dabit, qui cum grossis ceteris promergentes de medio utrarumque virgularum claviculo proferentur. The same account is given by Ambrose, *Operum* i. 1449. B—E: in *Lucam*, lib. vii. §. 162, and in terms so much

the same, as necessarily to lead to the inference that Ambrose borrowed from Hilary, or Hilary from Ambrose, or both from some common original. I give the latter part of this account: Etenim qua se medio trudere de cortice gemma consuevit, ea minutissima quæque hujus generis poma prorumpunt... itaque ceteris albetibus primo vere virtutis, sola ficus proprio nescit flore canescere; ideo fortasse quod nullus istis maturior sit usus in pomis. nam succedentibus aliis, hæc quasi degenerantia respuuntur, et arenti infirma radice, renovatis quibus sit succus utilior, exuruntur. manent tamen aliqua perrara, nec decidunt, quibus hic proventus ariserit; ut de medio duarum virgarum claviculo brevi erumpente promergant, quo geminis tecta præsiidiis tamquam naturæ parentis gremio, succi fotu plenioris inolescant. ea clementioris auræ provocata temperie, et prolixioribus adultiora temporibus, ubi sylvestrem animum succi prioris exuerint, specie ceteris et maturitatis gratia præferuntur.

Mr. Harmer, vol. i. 405. chap. iv. Obs. lv. informs us from Dr. Shaw, that though the Boccore or early fig is not ripe before June, nor the fig which is exported before August, yet a few figs are sometimes ripe six weeks or more earlier, and consequently in April or May.

in any year, it would be more particularly so in years when the Passover fell out late, and almost an entire month in advance of the summer compared with other times. In this year the Passover was celebrated on the fifth of April, only eleven days earlier than its latest time. Besides which, Josephus, in a passage which has been quoted elsewhere^g, informed us that in some situations, if not throughout all Judæa, the fig-tree produced a succession of fruit for ten months in the year; which ten months must have extended from March to December inclusive. Ripe figs might, consequently, be looked for in convenient places, and upon trees, whose appearance shewed them to be particularly healthy and vigorous, even at the end of March or the beginning of April: and it is to such early fruits as these that the allusions occur at Isaiah xxviii. 4, Micah vii. 1, Nahum iii. 12, and Hoshea ix. 10. Even now, according to the report of modern travellers, the early ripe figs, throughout the Levant, come into season in the month of June. Diodorus Siculus attested a similar fact concerning the sycamine, a species of mulberry, or something between the mulberry and the fig, in Egypt, the climate of which country was not more favourable for the production of such an effect, than that of Judæa; and yet this fruit was supplied so abundantly and so constantly, that the poor are said to have supported themselves upon it all the year round*.

* Diodorus, i. 34. Solinus, in his Polyhistor, describes this tree as follows: De arboribus, quas sola fert Ægyptus, præcipua est ficus Ægyptia, foliis moro comparanda; poma non ramis tantum gestitans, sed et caudice: usque adeo fœcunditati suæ an-

gusta est. uno anno septies fructum sufficit: unde pomum si decerpseris, alterum sine mora protuberat. Polyhistor, cap. xxxii. §. 34. Cf. Theophrastus, Historia Plantarum, i. 23. iv. 2—Pliny, H. N. xiii. 14. Strabo, xii. 3. §. 15. 81, 82, gives a simi-

It is very possible then that a tree, which from the advanced state of its foliage shewed that it was peculiarly strong and luxuriant, might be found to yield some of this early ripe fruit. Our Lord visited it more as a tentative experiment—if haply he might find ought upon it—than with the certain assurance that he should. Nor does this imply any defect of knowledge upon his part; for he was aware what the event would be: but the action being designed as symbolical, his going up to the tree in the apparent hope of meeting with fruit upon it, in the first place, and his pronouncing a curse upon its barrenness, as if in consequence of some disappointment, in the next, rendered it the more solemn, significant, and impressive*.

While St. Matthew and St. Mark, in their accounts of this transaction, agree together substantially, the latter, as usual, in the mention of circumstances is somewhat the more particular of the two. But this distinction must be understood with reference solely to the circumstances of the *act*: as to what followed, or is related subsequently, there is some difference which requires to be explained. The malediction pronounced on the tree, according to St. Matthew, took effect instantly—*ἐξηράνθη παραχρῆμα ἡ συκῆ*: the words could scarcely have been delivered before the tree had begun to be sensibly affected. Now both he and St. Mark expressly attest that the transaction occurred in the presence of the Twelve. Jesus was walking with them, when he

lar account of the productions of the plain of Themiscyra on the Pontus; where grapes, pears, apples, and every sort of fruit resembling the nut, were to be found in abundance at all seasons in the year.

* Cyril of Jerusalem, Opera, 176. l. 10: Catechesis xiii. 9: τίς

οὐκ οἶδεν ὅτι ἐν καιρῷ χειμῶνος συκῆ οὐ καρποφορεῖ, ἀλλὰ φύλλα περικείται μόνον; ὅπερ πάντες ᾔδεισαν, τοῦτο Ἰησοῦς ἄρα οὐκ ᾔδει; ἀλλ' εἰδὼς ἤρχετο ὡς ζητήσων· οὐκ ἄγνων ὅτι οὐχ εὕρισκει, ἀλλὰ τὸν τύπον τῆς κατάρως μέχρι τῶν φύλλων μόνον ποιοῦμενος.

fell in with the tree ; he went up to it in their sight ; and he pronounced the sentence of its perpetual barrenness in their hearing. The effect also, which ensued, ensued before their eyes ; they heard what had been said, according to St. Mark ; and they saw what was done by it, according to St. Matthew. It is no wonder, then, that they should have been surprised when they witnessed the change in the tree ; a change so suddenly produced ; the effect of a few words, and those not actually commanding it, though possibly presupposing it. It was equally natural that they should have expressed this surprise ; and as St. Matthew describes them to have done it, among themselves : and their surprise being known to our Saviour, not merely as it was expressed but also as it was *caused*, that he should have founded such reflections upon it, either for their admonition in particular or for that of others in general, as were appropriate and pertinent to the occasion, was just as much to be expected.

The Apostles wondered at the visible effect, produced upon the tree ; but more, perhaps, at the secret efficacy of the power which had produced it : and our Lord, according to his usual practice of deriving instruction from the occasion, and knowing that their admiration of this power was accompanied internally by the wish to possess it, tells them first, in reference to the object of their astonishment, that this was a slight effect, compared with what the same power, rightly applied, was capable of bringing to pass : secondly, in reference to the object of their wish, that this power to be rightly applied must be so through the medium of the implicit faith : thirdly, in reference to the virtue of this faith, it was such that whatsoever they might ask for in prayer, whether the

energies of miraculous power, or any other petition, if they believed they *did* obtain they *should* obtain : all which, if applied to the Apostles, was applicable only proleptically now, but might be so actually hereafter ; and yet it is so obviously the result of the passing event, that it might well have ensued at the time. And in fact, if there is any truth in St. Matthew's account, it must have ensued at the time. For as he makes the sudden drying up of the tree the cause of the wonder of the Apostles, so he makes the wonder of the Apostles the direct effect of the drying up of the tree. Are we to suppose, then, that the tree was dried up *now*, but the wonder was not felt until the following morning ? or as the tree was dried up on the spot, so that the wonder was felt and expressed upon the spot ? The very language of his account implies as much. The fig-tree, says he, was instantly dried up ; the disciples, continues he, when they saw it, exclaimed, How instantly is the fig-tree dried up ! *or*, as it may also be rendered, How is the fig-tree instantly dried up ? In either case, this drying up must have taken place, and been noticed accordingly on the spot.

These several particulars are not mentioned by St. Mark ; whose present account goes no further than the sentence of barrenness pronounced upon the tree : yet the very circumstance that it stops short even there, prepares the reader for something more afterwards. It does not say the fig-tree immediately dried up ; but it does say the disciples heard what was said. Now the effect did certainly follow upon the words at the time ; and it was of little use to observe that the by-standers *heard* the words, if their having *heard* them was not intended to account for something which they *said* or *did* : or that they heard them *now*, if it was not to explain something which they said or did at

another time. When therefore they were all returning by the same way on the following morning, they saw the tree, as the Evangelist tells us, dried up from the roots; and in consequence of that spectacle, one of them, Peter, was reminded of what he had heard the day before: and the very terms in which he proceeded to address our Saviour are a proof that he was reverting to a past transaction: See, Master, the fig-tree, which thou cursedst, is dried up.

This account, then, has clearly the appearance of a renewed conversation on the same subject; and not the less so, because the motive to it was the same; viz. the change both at first, and in this second instance, perceptible in the tree. Yet the renewal of the conversation is ascribed to one of the disciples only; the original remark to all: and with regard to the exciting cause, there is this difference upon each occasion, that St. Matthew simply says the tree ἐξηράνθη, was dried up or withered; St. Mark, that it had been dried up or withered ἐκ ῥιζῶν. The former would still be true, if the tree sensibly began to droop, or exhibited a perceptible contrast with its flourishing state a moment before; but the latter presupposes the absolute extinction of vegetable life. The one might take place on the spot; for it would be only the prelude to the final effect: the other, as the consummation itself, might not be complete until some time after. The former then might both be seen and commented upon at the time; the latter, not until the following morning. What further remarks, therefore, we may have to make upon the sequel of St. Mark's account, must be reserved for the next Dissertation, which will treat of the events of the ensuing day.

The incident respecting the fig-tree having thus transpired, on the way from Bethany to Jerusalem, be-

fore, rather than after, the first hour of the day; the arrival at the temple would take place rather after that hour, than before it. And if the cleansing of the temple was performed this day, and was the first thing done subsequent to the arrival, that also would come to pass after the first, yet before the second hour of the day. On this question, however, St. Matthew is apparently committed with St. Mark; the former, as it would seem, assigning the act of the cleansing to the day of the procession to the temple, the latter to the following morning: St. Luke, whose account of a similar transaction is such as might accord to either supposition, being consequently so far neuter.

Unless, therefore, the cleansing in St. Matthew was altogether a different transaction from the cleansing in St. Mark, the former has introduced an Anticipation, or the latter a Trajection into his accounts: and an Anticipation in St. Matthew would be no extraordinary phenomenon, but a Trajection in St. Mark would be one. If the two events were the same act, there is no avoiding this conclusion, except by supposing that St. Matthew begins his account of the proceedings on the eleventh of Nisan with this instance of cleansing, on the day after the public procession, at xxi. 12: which would be, in the first place, to resolve one difficulty by another; since though the two accounts of the cleansing might by this means be reconciled together, yet those of the malediction on the fig-tree, as we have seen, would be set at variance.

In the next place, the beautiful incident, relating to the children in the temple^h, bears upon its face the evidence that this part of the narrative at least belongs to the day of the procession. For when it is considered that our Lord set out that day amidst the shouts

^h Matt. xxi. 15, 16.

and acclamations of the multitude, the various strains of whose Hallelujahs did not prevent but that all might have been employed—and that he arrived in the temple similarly attended; when we consider also that the peculiar expressions, ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαβὶδ, are found in St. Matthew only, and yet are the very expressions which he puts into the mouths of the children; when we consider further the strong natural impulse of children to imitate what is passing around them; to mix eagerly in every scene of bustle and animation, and to be as loud and as active therein as any: we can entertain little doubt that they had caught these expressions from the multitude; they were merely doing what thousands of grown up persons had been, or were still doing besides. Unless therefore our Lord came again to the temple the next day, as he had done the day before, in a public procession, with similar demonstrations of the public enthusiasm; this little circumstance, which is as natural as it is beautiful, determines thus much of St. Matthew's account, from 14–17, to the evening of the tenth of Nisan.

There is no alternative then but to conclude that either the same act of cleansing was twice performed, once on the evening of the tenth and again on the morning of the eleventh of Nisan, or that St. Matthew has recorded it out of its place. The first of these suppositions may possibly be true; but for the reasons which I shall proceed to subjoin, I do not think it so probable as the second.

First, the comparison of the two accounts leads to this conclusion rather than any other. With the exception of one particularⁱ, καὶ οὐκ ἤφθιεν ἵνα τις διενέγκῃ σκεῦος διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, there is not a circumstance, and scarcely an expression, in the one which does not occur

ⁱ Mark xi. 16.

in the other; so much so, that St. Mark might even have copied from St. Matthew. This additional particular itself constitutes no mark of discrimination between two otherwise identical acts: for Josephus and Maimonides^k both shew that it would be equally necessary to the integrity of either. To carry vessels into, or through the temple; even to admit any, except what were consecrated to the service of the temple; was always forbidden, and would have been considered a profanation. That our Lord's declaration accompanying the act is expressed interrogatively in St. Mark, and directly in St. Matthew, and with *πασι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* in the former, though wanting in the latter, is too trifling an objection to be insisted on. The last circumstance amounts merely to an omission; which in St. Matthew's time, when the church was composed of Hebrews only—all zealous for the Law—might be made out of accommodation to their prejudices: and both this difference and the other are easily explained on the ground of his characteristic conciseness. In short, the account of neither is as different from that of the other, as the account of either from that of St. Luke; which yet must be the same with one of them, if not with both.

Secondly, when our Lord entered the temple on the evening of the tenth of Nisan, it is probable that the traders, with their droves of cattle and their other effects, had already removed them for the day; or that the very pressure of the multitudes, by which he was attended, would force them to give way. The outermost court (of which alone they were in possession) would be the first entered and the most completely occupied; for many would have access to that who could

^k Contra Apionem, ii. cap. 8. p. 1244. De *Ædificio Templi*, i. 20.

not gain admission beyond it. The next morning, however, our Lord returned in a private manner; accompanied merely by the Twelve: and if he returned, as we supposed, soon after the first hour of the day, the traders would then be in the midst of their occupation; and not only zeal for the honour of God, indignation at the profanation of his house to worldly purposes, and a just regard to the privileges of the Gentiles, who were thus dispossessed of their proper court, or condemned to share it with beasts and birds; but even a desire to facilitate the resort of the people to himself, might lead him to the act.

Thirdly, if this profanation had been resented the evening before, and yet was still going on the next morning, the previous rebuke, it is manifest, had failed of its effect: the traders had set the authority of our Lord at defiance, and were determined to keep up the abuse in spite of him. In this case, either a succession of similar acts of correction, as often as he visited the temple, must have been necessary to enforce submission; and we might expect the same act of cleansing to have been *thrice* performed, as well as *twice*: or if a single instance of it was not likely to be sufficient for the end in view, it would never have been attempted at all. Not to mention that, at this period, the common people universally esteemed our Lord as a Prophet, and would look upon all his acts with submission; though that had not been the case, still if *he* thought proper to assert an authority of this kind, he himself would doubtless accompany the assertion of it with such an impression of involuntary dread and reverence, as would not fail to render it effectual, and prevent the necessity of repeating it.

Fourthly, Luke xix. 47, which subjoins an account of his employment after the cleansing, is a strong pre-

sumptive argument that it happened at the beginning of some day. Ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, literally interpreted, means, He was teaching *for the day* in the temple, *not*, He was teaching *daily* in the temple¹; which would have required καθ' ἡμέραν merely: and whether it describes the employment of that one day in particular, or of others after that in general, still it implies that the business of teaching in every instance, and consequently on this day among the rest, took up the best part of a day at least. Such a description, then, would be apt and appropriate, if the cleansing immediately before it, happened at the hour of πρωΐ, on the eleventh of Nisan; but not, if it occurred at the hour of ὀψία, the evening before. There is no proof that our Lord taught that evening at all; and if we consider the lateness of the time when he arrived in the temple, the speediness of his departure again, and the ferment and agitation of the public mind; a ferment and agitation, which were at their highest, when his procession was come to the temple; there will be no reason to suppose that he could have taught at all. The stillness, the composure, the gravity, the attention, necessary to the business of teaching, were incompatible with the circumstances of the occasion. This very agitation, produced as it was by the confident but mistaken belief that his kingdom was now at hand, might be a chief reason both why he selected a late hour of the day for visiting the temple, and why, after a short stay there, he so quickly withdrew into privacy under cover of the night.

The mention also of the indignation of the Jewish rulers, in the same passage of St. Luke which describes this employment, can be resolved into no cause, but the

¹ Vide Luke xi. 3. compared with Matt. vi. 11.

assumption of the authority implied by the act of cleansing immediately preceding. The mere circumstance of teaching subsequently, if it had not been preceded by that, was not sufficient to have produced this indignation ; especially so far as to have made them seek to destroy him on the spot, had they not been restrained by the fear of the people. Nor is it any objection that St. Luke prefixes no note of time, which might have determined the act of cleansing to the morning of the eleventh of Nisan : for his Gospel, in this part, is strikingly distinguished by that anecdotal character, which as we observed elsewhere^m, was more or less peculiar to all the Evangelists : in consequence whereof, it is plain that he intended to relate not the transactions of every successive day, as in full or as of successive days, but only in part—only as those of distinct days. Thus, between xix. 29. and xix. 44, he comprehends whatsoever he designed to relate of the events of the *tenth* of Nisan—between xix. 45. and the end of the chapter, all that he would say of the *eleventh*—between xx. 1. and xxi. 38, all that he would say of the *twelfth*. Nor can the peculiarity of this structure be better illustrated, than by the idiomatic preface to the events of this last day itself : And it came to pass on one of those daysⁿ. He speaks of this day as something uncertain, indefinite, unconnected with what goes before ; yet he knew it to be, and intended it to be understood as the day consecutive on the close of events in the preceding chapter.

Fifthly, the question, openly put to our Saviour on the morning of the Wednesday in Passion-week, respects the usurpation, as it implies, of authority either then or the day before. St. Mark's account of this question is: By what authority doest thou *these things*^o?

^m Dissertation iii. Vol. i. 237, 238.

ⁿ Ch. xx. 1.

^o Ch. xi. 28.

and who gave thee this authority that thou shouldest do *these things*? Now before this, according to the same account, our Lord was merely *walking* in the temple : he had not therefore yet begun even to teach, though that might have been construed into the unjust assumption of authority in question ; nor was he performing miracles. It follows then, that the question must be understood *reflexively* ; not of what he was doing exactly on that day or at that time, but of what he had done the day before, and when he cleansed the temple. Once, at the beginning of his ministry, a similar act was performed by him, and followed substantially by a similar question ^p : What sign dost thou shew us, that thou doest these things? which was virtually to ask by what authority he did those things. For none but a Prophet of acknowledged dignity, none, perhaps, at this period of Jewish history but the Messiah himself, could lay claim to, or exert as his own, such a jurisdiction as this ; and by asserting his right to this our Lord virtually asserted himself to be the Messiah. At the beginning of his ministry the Jews, as yet ignorant of the nature or of the grounds of his pretensions, might well ask by what authority he did such things ; and at its close, when they had long made up their minds not to acknowledge them, they might just as naturally do the same. Why then we may ask, did not the Sanhedrim put this demand on the Tuesday, the day after the *first* cleansing, instead of deferring it until the Wednesday, the day after the *second* ? If there was but *one* cleansing, and that on the Tuesday, their conduct admits of explanation. The question might have been concerted on the evening of the Tuesday, and preferred on the morning of the Wednesday ; and this part of our Lord's conduct, by being probably the least

acceptable to all who had an interest in the maintenance of the abuse, if not to the people universally, furnished, perhaps, the best and readiest handle against him of any.

Sixthly, when it is considered that our Lord attended the Passover *three* times, and other feasts, in the course of his ministry, at least *twice*; that his daily resort, on these occasions, was to the temple; that the profanation of the outer court was of long standing, and certainly in existence three years before the present time, yet nevertheless that he took upon himself to repress it only twice; between which instances there is this remarkable coincidence, that the first was at the very commencement, the second at the very conclusion of his ministry: we may justly infer that he had sufficient reasons for repressing it only twice, and that the particular seasons, when he did so, were the best which could be chosen for the purpose. This purpose, I think, was to avow himself the Messiah as publicly as possible—and not the less significantly, because by an action and not a declaration. The propriety of such an avowal, at the outset of his ministry, is undeniable; and a little reflection will shew that it would be equally well timed at its close. It could not prematurely endanger his safety *then*; and it could as little accelerate his death *now*. But we know not what it might have done at any intermediate period. The same prudential motive, which, for a year and six months, kept him away from Jerusalem altogether, would perhaps have restrained him, if he had been on the spot, from any such act as this.

Now the correspondency between the beginning and the end of his ministry, and the use or design of the same action with respect to each; cannot be otherwise preserved than by supposing it performed the same num-

ber of times at each. If he cleansed the temple only once *then*, he would naturally cleanse it only once *now*: if a single assertion of authority was sufficient for the end in view at *that* time, a single assertion might suffice for the same end at *this*. St. Mark's περιβλεψάμενος πάντα . . . ἐξῆλθε would scarcely be intelligible, if it did not imply that something ensued from that examination on another day, which had not followed on that; that in short it was a scrutiny of the state of things at the time, preparatory to some correction of them on the morrow. Our Lord had no object in this first visit, except to fulfil the legal equity by presenting himself before God; and it was more in unison with the meekness, which eminently became the spiritual Antitype of the legal emblem, in which capacity he both presented himself, and was about to suffer, that he should not perform such an act precisely at that time and on that occasion. This reason would not operate on the morrow; he would then be free to assert what authority he pleased: and the very purposes of his ministry from that time forward, both to impress all with a proper respect for his character, and to remove every obstruction in the way of the resort to his teaching, might actually require it.

Seventhly, admitting the fact of an Anticipation in St. Matthew, we may yet advance some reasons to account for it.

I. There is nothing in this part of his narrative which would not be strictly true, if referred to the following day. Jesus entered into the temple of God on this occasion; he did so on the next: he cast out those who were buying and selling; he must have done the same again in the morning, even if he had done it already the evening before. The whole account consequently may be strictly parenthetic.

II. If we except the incident respecting the fig-tree, which happened before the arrival in the temple, there is nothing recorded of the events of the eleventh of Nisan even by St. Mark, whose account is the most particular of any, but this act of cleansing the temple; and by St. Matthew there is nothing recorded at all. Yet, as our Lord came to the temple early, and did not leave it again until late, he must have passed a whole day there. It follows then, that during an entire day's continuance in the temple there was no one transaction, except the act of cleansing the temple, which any of the Evangelists considered sufficiently memorable to deserve express mention. Compare this silence, and the inference thence deducible, with the number, the variety, and the circumstantial detail of particulars recorded on the following day; and it may be considered not improbable that the peculiar tranquillity of the day before was due to the awe inspired by this act of cleansing itself.

If then this particular transaction, as it stands in St. Matthew, does not belong to the eleventh of Nisan, we possess from him no account of the events of that day (at least within the temple) whatever. Admitting therefore that it may be an irregularity, still we may explain the irregularity if it relates to the only event on the Tuesday in Passion-week, which he thought it necessary to record. With his usual attention to conciseness in the merely historical portions of his narrative, he has joined it to the account of the transactions on the Monday; but he has joined it in such a manner, as by no means to imply a strict order of sequence in the course of events. It would be an additional motive to the Anticipation, that this act, whensoever it took place, happened *as* Jesus came into the temple; it was the *first* thing done either that evening, or on the

following morning. Besides, there was this connection between the *same* act of cleansing, and *each* of these visits, that it must have been conceived at the one, though it might not have been executed until the other. In a word, the Anticipation is justified by the necessity of the case, and amounts only to a single day. If St. Matthew intended to relate nothing which transpired on the following day, and yet wished to perpetuate this particular fact, he must relate it *out* of its place; and next to its own in the order of succession, the place where he has inserted it was clearly the most convenient of any.

DISSERTATION XL.

On the proceedings of Wednesday in Passion-week, and on the time of the unction at Bethany.

THE transactions of this day, which answers to the morning of the Jewish twelfth of Nisan, and to the Julian third of April, are not only the most diversified in their circumstances, and the most minutely related, but the most interesting in themselves of any which have yet been considered. The day, too, is memorable as the close of our Lord's public ministry : after this time, until the morning of the crucifixion, he never appeared openly again. It was, consequently, a remarkable coincidence, resolvable perhaps solely into the agency of a controlling Providence ; that the last and concluding scene of his ministry furnished the clearest indications, which had yet been exhibited, both of the malice, the hypocrisy, and the subtlety of his enemies on the one hand, and of his own wisdom, power, and Divine authority on the other.

The arrangement of its particulars is easy and obvious ; since, with one exception which will be noticed in its place, the narratives of the several Evangelists concur in the order of their accounts. The conclusion also of St. John's Gospel, from xii. 37. to 50, will be found to belong to the same day.

The first circumstance is manifestly the renewal of the conversation, in reference to the fig-tree, Mark xi. 20-26 : the time and the place of which must consequently have been either the same as those of the original incident the day before, or not much different from them. The sequel of this history is evidently like

the resumption of a former topic ; and we have seen too many instances elsewhere of similar repetitions, to be surprised at the recurrence of the same sentiments, and even of the same expressions.

The motive to the renewal of the conversation might obviously be the same as the cause of the original discourse ; admiration of the effect produced, and a secret wish to possess the power which produced it. Nor is it of any importance from what quarter, whether one of the disciples or more, the allusion in question proceeded. If the motive to the allusion was the same, or if the allusion was merely an accidental, yet still a natural remark, our Lord might found upon it the same kind of reflections as before. Yet is there a perceptible difference in the account of what he *now* said, compared with what he had said before ; proving the two occasions to be distinct. Mark xi. 22, 23, 24, is not the same with Matt. xxi. 21, 22 : and Mark xi. 25, 26, contrary to that Evangelist's usual practice, even supplies something more as *said*, which is not to be found in St. Matthew.

Nor can it be urged in explanation of this omission by the latter, that the part so left out was irrelevant to the scope and drift of the part recorded. For besides its general use, as prescribing a certain condition to the success of prayer to God in behalf of sins universally ; (which is its primary intention ;) it is applicable even to the case of prayer for the success of the miraculous faith in particular. Without charitableness and a disposition to forgive, as eminently the qualification of a Christian minister in general, God might no more cooperate with the prayer of *faith* for the performance of a miracle, than with the prayer of *repentance* for the forgiveness of sins. Nor is this the only occasion ^a,

^a See Luke xvii. 3, 4, 5.

when the doctrine of charity is seen to go hand in hand with the doctrine of the miraculous faith.

The remaining events of the day are to be divided into those which occurred in the temple, before our Lord quitted it for the night; and those which occurred out of it, after he had quitted it for the night.

The particulars of the first division consist chiefly of a series of questions, put to our Saviour one after another, until he had successively foiled the interrogators, or replied to all their inquiries: so that, from that time forward, no man durst ask any more. The two first of these questions turned upon a civil or political, much more than upon a religious or doctrinal point: the two last were purely of the latter description. The final end proposed by them all, except perhaps the last, was sinister; that of the two first, to render our Lord amenable to the *spiritual* jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim, or to the *civil* jurisdiction of the Roman governor; that of the third, if not of the fourth, by a perplexing and an apparently insuperable difficulty to lower his credit as a teacher. The parties, from whom they proceeded, were in every instance one or more of the three existing and principal sects, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Herodians; the two former a philosophical or religious denomination; the latter, probably a civil; retaining though covertly the principles of Judas of Galilee; which accounts for the question put by them. In all of them, however, the Pharisees in general, and the leading members of the Sanhedrim in particular, appear to have taken either openly or in secret the most active and the most influential part.

When, therefore, we consider the common antipathy and want of union, prevailing in other respects between these sects, and yet the concurrence of all not

merely simultaneously, but in a regular order of succession, to injure or to criminate our Saviour, we may justly conclude that they did not act at random, nor independently of each other; but upon some preconcerted plan, and with a mutual understanding. They had agreed to forget for the time their preexisting jealousies and differences of opinion; while they aided and supported each other in a common attack upon our Lord. It is true, the method of disputation among the Jews was purely *dialectic*; that is, by asking questions and receiving answers. But on no occasion, except this, may each of the sects in its turn be seen united in a single endeavour to puzzle or to ensnare the same person, with their most difficult or most dangerous problems; and like so many *ἑφεδροι* successively entering the lists against him. We may argue, therefore, that they acted on a scheme concerted overnight; and that our Lord's oldest, most inveterate, and most powerful enemies, the Pharisees, were probably the contrivers and abettors of the plan. Nor is this supposition without its use in accounting for the immediate origin of that highly-wrought invective, which will be found recorded as the last event of the proceedings in the temple for the day; and which our Lord, in his turn, levelled against that sect in particular. The present, however, is not the place to enter upon the consideration of any of these questions, further than as concerns the order of their succession in the general arrangement of facts.

First, then, while Jesus, after his return to the temple, as St. Mark informs us, was still walking about therein; and as St. Matthew, or St. Luke tells us, when he was teaching, or beginning to teach, and to preach the Gospel; the entire body of the Sanhedrim, or a deputation from each of its members, the chief of the

Priests, the Scribes, and the Elders *—came upon him with the interrogation, By what authority doest thou these things? the reference in which to the act of cleansing the temple we have already considered. If our Lord had either not yet begun to teach, or only just done so, the time of this question would be very probably soon after *πρωί*. The question would be publicly put, and the answer to it would be publicly returned: but the consultation of the Sanhedrim upon the answer must have taken place apart: that is, in their own *conclave*, or council-chamber, the site of which was upon the confines of the priests', and of the men's, courts respectively. The history of this transaction is remarkably similar in each of the narratives.

Upon the close of this account, St. Matthew subjoins the moral illustration of the father, and the two sons^b; the application of which by our Lord shews that it had reference to the preceding question, and therefore might have been suggested by it. The point of the comparison must be sought for in the historical fact of the different success of the same preaching of John, like the alleged different success of the same request of the father; of the former with two very different orders of persons, the Scribes and the Pharisees, on the one hand, and the publicans and sinners, on the other; of the latter with his two sons, as the first or as the last addressed respectively. The antecedent self-righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees answered to the ap-

* Each of these classes, it is probable, consisted of twenty-four persons, making up the number seventy-two in all. This is certain of the Heads of the courses, or *Ἀρχιερείς*, among whom the High-priest also would

be included: and from Rev. iv. 4, it may be presumptively collected of the Elders, or *Πρεσβύτεροι*: in which case, it must have been true of the Scribes, or *Γραμματεῖς*, likewise.

^b Ch. xxi. 28—32.

parent readiness of the last addressed ; the antecedent wickedness and impenitence of publicans and sinners to the apparent refusal of the first. Yet the preaching of John had failed with the former, and succeeded with the latter ; as the second son had broken his original promise, and the first had retracted his original refusal.

That St. Mark omitted this discourse is nothing extraordinary ; and that St. Luke did so is explained by a comparison with Luke vii. 29, 30, which is substantially to the same effect. The parable of the vineyard let out to husbandmen is a parable of a different description, recorded by each of these Evangelists, and by each in a consecutive order. Nor could it have been long over, before another of the same class, recorded by St. Matthew only, the parable of the wedding-garment, was also subjoined ; the omission of which in St. Mark is to be explained as before ; and its omission in St. Luke by its partial resemblance to a parable, which was previously recorded by him and by him alone, the parable of the great supper^c.

The next incident appears to have been the question concerning the payment of tribute to the Roman emperor, who, at this time, was Tiberius Cæsar ; touching consequently upon the principles first openly avowed in U. C. 760, by Judas the Gaulanite, commonly called the Galilean. This question was put by the Herodians ; but it was suggested and abetted by the Pharisees : and the account of its circumstances, though substantially the same in all, is yet much closer together in St. Matthew and St. Mark, than in either and St. Luke ; whose conciseness in particular is easily explained by the minuteness of the other two. Yet with his usual attention to precision, he has specified most distinctly

^c Ch. xiv. 15—24.

both the design proposed by the question, and the effect produced by the answer. Writing also for Gentile readers, and not with the associations of a Jew himself, he suppresses the name, while he describes the character, of the instruments now employed; viz. as parties *suborned*, or put forward by others; feigning themselves *righteous*, that is, actuated by a *zeal* for God—whose exclusive right to the civil obedience of the Jews was the question concerned in the solution of the practical difficulty, respecting the payment of tribute to Cæsar. This assumption of pretended righteousness appears in the language of their hypocritical compliment to our Saviour, at the outset of the address; as recorded by St. Mark. Διδάσκαλε, Rabbi or Master, we know that thou art ἀληθής, a plain-spoken, sincere, and honest man; who, when the truth is concerned, carest for no one: for thou payest no respect to the person of men; but teachest of a truth the way of God. The name of Herodians does not occur in the Gospel of St. Luke.

The next circumstance on record is the question proposed by the Sadducees; in which, though the Pharisees might have rejoiced to see Jesus perplexed by it, unless they had their own mode of solving the problem, they could not, perhaps, openly have concurred: for the belief in the resurrection of the dead, so far at least as was implied by a belief in the immortality and metempsychosis of the human soul, was a point of distinction between them and the Sadducees: of which Acts xxiii. 6. 8. alone is a proof. It is the object of this question, while it seems to acknowledge the futurity of a resurrection, in reality to endeavour to disprove it; assuming, indeed, a false principle, viz. that the acquired relations, which before existed between the children of this life, will exist between the children of

the resurrection; and consequently that the relations of marriage, which were established here, will be recognised and perpetuated there. Admit this principle, and also the truth of the fact which they allege, and which, though an exaggerated, might yet be an actual case; (nor does our Lord argue with them on the ground of its falsity;) and such an absurdity would result, as to discredit the futurity of any resurrection whatever.

Our Saviour's answer is directed accordingly, first to the exposure of the fallacy of their assumption; which being destroyed, the question of a resurrection to come is left free to its proper arguments of conviction: and, secondly, to establish that futurity upon such authority as the inquirers themselves acknowledged; the testimony of the word of God in the Pentateuch. This then is the first inquiry which was strictly doctrinal; concerning the knowledge and interpretation of the ancient Scriptures, as much as the wisdom and authority of our Saviour: and St. Matthew, by the usual note of time in this instance, which he premises to other remarkable passages in the course of his Gospel, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ^d, does as good as prepare the way for the introduction of a new and a more important topic.

The primary intention of the institution of marriage, in the infancy of the human race, was doubtless the multiplication of mankind; and its first and most direct effect was the preservation of the species amidst the constant decay and destruction of the individuals. It was so far a remedy for the curse of mortality, entailed upon men by the sin of their first parents; since though individual men and women all died and must die, yet men and women, by the appointment of mar-

^d Ch. xxii. 23.

riage, still were and still will be kept alive. And doubtless this effect will continue until the multiplication of the human species reaches to that extent, which is its proposed limit in the purposes of the Divine Providence: and then the resurrection of the dead, it may be expected, will ensue. But when this has come to pass what further need can there be of marriage? for both the species of mankind can receive, or can require no more augmentation, beyond its preexisting multiplication; and the individuals, male or female, who compose it, will no longer be mortal as before. For none, who have once been raised from death to life, will be liable to die again in the same sense as before. This truth seems to be intimated by our Saviour's words in disproof of the assumption of the Sadducees: οὐτε γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται^e: They neither marry, nor are given in marriage—for neither can they die any more; that is, they are immortal*.

With regard to the harmony of the several accounts, every discrepancy is trifling, except what concerns the terms or the order of our Lord's reply. The method of arranging this will best be exhibited in its place hereafter; and I will observe only at present that the concluding words of St. Luke's account, πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν, are parallel in point of construction to this passage of Josephus: οἱ τεθνήκασι τὸ πλεόν Ἀντιπάτρῳ^f

* Irenæus, Opera, 191. 19: lib. ii. cap. lxii: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, πληρῶθέντος τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ οὗ αὐτὸς παρ' αὐτῷ προώρισε, πάντες οἱ ἐγγραφέντες εἰς ζωὴν ἀναστήσονται, ἴδια ἔχοντες σώματα, καὶ ἰδίας ἔχοντες ψυχὰς, καὶ ἴδια πνεύματα, ἐν οἷς ἐνῆρξθησαν τῷ Θεῷ . . . καὶ πάν-

σονται ἐκάτεροι τοῦ γεννᾶν ἔτι καὶ γεννᾶσθαι, καὶ γαμεῖν καὶ γαμεῖσθαι· ἵνα τὸ σύμμετρον φύλον τῆς προορίσεως ἀπὸ Θεοῦ. (legendum forsan, τῆς προωρισμένης ὑπὸ Θεοῦ) ἀνθρωπότητος ἀποτελεσθεῖς (lege ἀποτελεσθὲν) τὴν ἁρμονίαν τηρήσῃ τοῦ πατρός.

^e Luke xx. 36.

^f Bell. i. xxxii. 2.

—or to this: εἰδότες ὅτι οἱ διὰ τὸν Θεὸν ἀποθνήσκοντες ζῶσι τῷ Θεῷ, ὥσπερ Ἀβραὰμ, Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ πάντες οἱ πατριάρχαι &c.

The answer, as we learn expressly from St. Luke and by implication from St. Mark, gave so much satisfaction to certain Scribes present—doubtless of the sect of the Pharisees—as to draw forth an open avowal of their approbation; Διδάσκαλε, καλῶς εἶπας. Its effect upon the multitude is stated by St. Matthew only; but the impression it produced upon the interrogators, as the sect of the Sadducees in particular, that they durst not ask him any thing more, that is, try to renew the dispute either on that, or on any other subject, is noticed most distinctly by St. Luke. This sect therefore was now put to silence.

One of the above-mentioned Scribes, as we may collect from St. Mark, it was consequently, who put the next question, concerning the greatest commandment in the Law; which St. Luke has omitted altogether, and St. Matthew has recorded only in part; the reason of which omission, and why St. Mark was probably induced to give a further, and a more distinct account of this incident than St. Matthew had given, cannot now be stated at large; because they are both closely connected with the parable of the good Samaritan, related exclusively by St. Luke. The motive of this inquirer I believe was good; and therefore that St. Matthew's *πειράζων*, in reference to his act, must be literally interpreted of *making trial* only, and with a sincere desire of information. Nor when he says, just before, that the Pharisees were collected together, is it implied that this man was put forward by the rest; or acted as their spokesman, and not of his own

accord*. It may be inferred from both Evangelists, that the terms of the question were probably these—*ποία ἐστὶ πρώτη πασῶν ἐντολὴ, καὶ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ*; and the terms of our Lord's decision, as a categorical answer to a categorical question—*αὕτη ἐστὶ πρώτη, καὶ μεγάλη, ἐντολὴ*^h—do so far confirm the inference. After this, as we learn from St. Mark, No man durst ask him any more questions: an observation, which comes somewhat later in St. Matthew, viz. at the end of the next transaction; but is clearly to be understood reflexively of the effect of this.

The whole time hitherto taken up it may not be possible exactly to determine; but the last particular could not be much earlier than the incident relating to the widow's mite; nor that incident than the commencement of evening service, one of the stated times when such oblations were wont to be made; viz. from the ninth hour of the day to the eleventh.

While the Pharisees were still assembled together, as we learn from the same authority, and consequently, not long after the last question; our Lord, in his turn, began to interrogate them, by demanding publicly whose son the Christ was to be. Now it appears from St. Mark and from St. Luke, who do not mention his personally addressing himself to the Scribes and the Pharisees in the first instance, but suppose him to argue directly from some tenet or admission of their's, that his motive, in putting the question, was to make them commit themselves by returning the answer; upon which, without continuing to speak to them, he

* The Pharisees being a distinct body, whose numbers, in his own time, Josephus represents at 6000—they might be collected together; so many at least of them, as happened to be present at a given time and in a given place.

^h Matt. xxii. 38.

must have turned to the people, and reasoned on the answer as St. Mark and St. Luke describe him to have done. Nor is St. Matthew at variance with them: for first, in direct refutation of the answer of the Pharisees we may suppose our Lord to have said to them — πῶς οὖν Δαβὶδ, ἐν πνεύματι, Κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖⁱ; and then, turning to the auditors, as St. Mark and St. Luke each imply, to have reasoned more at length, πῶς λέγουσιν οἱ Γραμματεῖς, κ', τ. λ. with which the residue of St. Matthew's account is obviously reconcilable.

This incident also furnishes a strong argument in favour of the proper divinity, and yet of the proper humanity of Jesus Christ; without the admission of both which a Socinian of the present day would be as much puzzled by our Saviour's question as a Pharisee of old. The true drift of that question is to prove the divinity of the Christ, and yet not to dispute or disprove the humanity; and to those who acknowledge both these truths, but to those only, there is no difficulty how to answer it. I apprehend that it was never meant to be denied, neither by our Lord himself, nor by those to whom he was speaking, that the Christ was to be the *Son* of David; but I do apprehend it was meant to be implied by him, whether they, with whom he was arguing, were disposed to admit it or not, that he was also to be the Son of God. For if the Christ was the *Lord* of David, the Christ was superior to David; and if the Christ was superior to David, the Christ was something more than the Son of David: that is, besides being the Son of David, he was also the Son of God. The Christ, therefore, was both man and God; man, as the Son of David, and God, as the Son of God. It is impossible that these distinctions can hold good of the Christ, if his genera-

ⁱ Matt. xxii. 43.

tion was altogether in the natural way ; but they may obviously do so, if the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation is scriptural and true : for then the Christ, by the assumption of flesh in the womb of the blessed Virgin, became as truly the Son of David, as by virtue of his eternal generation he was previously, and still continued to be the Son of God.

After this we must place Mark xii. 38–40, and Luke xx. 45–47, the first personal and direct attack upon the Scribes, as recorded by St. Mark and by St. Luke in terms almost the same ; and which it is impossible to confound with that longer and later invective, Matt. xxiii. throughout. First, because this is levelled against the Scribes as such alone ; that, at the Pharisees also, or at the Scribes only as the same with the Pharisees ; so that in none of the woes, though eight times repeated, does the mention of either occur apart from the other. Yet Scribe and Pharisee were not necessarily convertible terms, as Acts xxiii. 6. alone would be sufficient to prove *. Secondly, because this was addressed, as we learn from St. Luke, to our Lord's own disciples in particular ; that, to the multitude at large, or to others as well as to them. Thirdly, because this is levelled against a *single* vice, the pride or arrogance of the parties addressed ; that, against a *complication* of vices. Fourthly, because this can, on no principle, be considered merely as an *epitome* of that ; and if it is not an epitome of it, it must be distinct from it. Fifthly, because a good reason may be assigned why St. Luke in particular might omit the *second* invective, though he recorded the *first*, provided they were really distinct ; viz. its resemblance to what he had related

* The Scribes were probably the Pharisees might belong to all of the tribe of Levi ; but any of the tribes.

before^k; but no reason, why he should record *one* sentence, and not the remainder of the same discourse. Sixthly, because such a discourse as the invective recorded by St. Matthew must needs have been recited in full; or omitted altogether. It is so entirely one piece—so connected from beginning to ending—so solemn, energetic, and dignified, considered in any point of view; that no Evangelist would have thought of exhibiting it in detail, nor except as one whole. Seventhly, because this preliminary caution may be very well attributed, on the principle of association, to the preceding conversation; errors in doctrine, if authorized by any party or persons, naturally suggesting errors in practice, which may be countenanced by the same. Eighthly, because it may be regarded as a becoming prelude to the more serious invective, about to ensue; and would render that the less unexpected, when it arrived. Ninthly, because that invective was clearly the fruit of a long accumulation of offences, and due to many serious grounds of rebuke; but chiefly to the sin and the guilt of infidelity, and to the failure of our Saviour's personal ministry with the people at large; a guilt and a failure, supposed to lie mainly at the door of the parties addressed; whose systematic hostility and opposition to him, with their influence over the common people, were principally chargeable with the result. Tenthly, because after the delivery of that longer invective it is morally certain that our Lord immediately left the temple, and never returned to it again: whereas St. Mark and St. Luke both attest that, when he had made an end of the former address, he spent some time in contemplating the resort of the people, with their respective contributions, to the treasury; upon which occasion they record the anecdote

^k Ch. xi. 37—the end.

of the poor widow's mite. If he was sitting at the time in the women's court, (which John viii. 20. renders probable,) his position was favourable to that survey; for the treasury or corban was situated in that court, and over against its porches*¹. Αἱ στοαὶ δὲ μεταξὺ τῶν πυλῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους ἔνδον ἐστραμμέναι πρὸ τῶν γαζοφυλακίων, κ', τ. λ. Between the time of that address then, and the time of the next in St. Matthew, there must have been some interval; and it is a further proof of this fact that, with the account of the widow's offering, the other two conclude their history of the transactions in the temple altogether; and what they next relate is our Lord's passing out of it for the night. The anecdote of the widow's mite was consequently one of the last, but it was not the very last of these transactions: it could not have followed after Matt. xxiii. at least; it must have come, therefore, between that and Mark xii. 40, or Luke xx. 47.

After this event, but before the next, it seems the most convenient place to insert John xii. 37. to the end; alluded to above. First, because from the express testimony of verse 36, what is afterwards recorded must have happened subsequently to the tenth of Nisan, the day of our Lord's first visit to, and departure from the temple; and subsequently also to the *evening* of that day, which we have shewn to have been the time when he quitted the temple. Secondly, because it is equally certain from xiii. 1. that it must have transpired before

* The treasury was situated in the women's court, no doubt, that the women, who might be disposed to make contributions to it, might have access to it; as was the case with the widow, when she threw in her mite. Our Lord, too, appears to have

sat there in particular for a similar reason, that the female Israelites might have access to him, as well as the male, whether to hear his discourses, or to partake of the benefit of his miracles.

¹ Jos. Bell. Jud. v. v. 2.

the thirteenth of Nisan, when St. John, as we shall see, resumes the thread of his account, upon the evening prior to the passion. If so, it must have come between these extremes exactly; later than the tenth, but earlier than the thirteenth of Nisan; and consequently either on the eleventh or on the twelfth.

That the discourse here recorded was delivered in the temple may be taken for granted; and our Lord it will be said was on both the above days in the temple, and, therefore, that it might have been delivered on either of them. But from the strain both of the Evangelist's reflections, 37-43, and of the discourse itself, it can be referred to no day with so much propriety as the last day of our Lord's public ministry; that is, the twelfth of Nisan: nor for the same reason to any period of that day, except just before he left the temple. The reflections of the Evangelist are intended to account for the continued infidelity of the Jews, notwithstanding the many proofs which Jesus had exhibited before them; and to shew that the failure of his ministry at last was due not to any defect in the means of conviction, on his part, but to a moral incapacity of being rightly influenced by them, on their's: reflections, which would be natural and in character at the close of our Lord's ministry, when there was an end of the endeavour, and a certainty of the failure to convince; but not before it, when the process of conviction was still pending and the result of the process was still doubtful. The tenor of our Saviour's words is in unison with the same conclusion. They are to be regarded as a *final* warning; declaring, for the last time, what should be the consequence of ultimate perseverance in unbelief: and this is especially observable of verse 47, to the end — καὶ ἐάν τις μου ἀκούσῃ οὕτω λαλῶ. Under this *word*, which he had preached among them, are included

all the personal exertions and all the proper evidences of his ministry. The time when it should cease to be preached was now arrived ; and having been preached to the last, as it had all along before, without avail, it should thenceforth be laid up—a faithful witness both of what our Lord himself had done to effect the conversion of the Jews, and of what they, by their obstinate impenitence, had frustrated—ready to be produced, as their accuser and their condemner, at the last day.

This point being presumptively established, we may much more confidently assume that the next transaction, the denunciation of woes against the Scribes and Pharisees, which takes up the whole of Matt. xxiii. was immediately followed by the departure from the temple. It is morally certain that a direct attack, like this, on his worst and most powerful enemies, would be reserved by our Lord for the close of the day. Nor, if we consider the warmth and vehemence of the invective ; the spirit which animates the whole, beginning in a tone as calm and dispassionate, as it is firm and collected, but gradually taking fire as the discourse advances, and kindling at length into a terrific blaze of indignation ; when we consider the keenness, and yet the justice of its reproofs ; the open exposure, which it makes, of the artifices, the delusions, the hypocrisy, and the wickedness of the most arrogant, and the most influential sect of its time : can we suppose they could hear it pronounced, without the utmost exasperation ; nor that, having formally bid them defiance, and inflamed their resentment and their malice to the highest degree, our Lord would continue much longer among them. Besides, if any regard is due to the plain meaning of terms, not to say to his own veracity, it can scarcely be doubted that, as he delivered the concluding sentence, λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν· οὐ μὴ με ἴδῃτε ἂπ' ἄρτι, ἕως ἂν εἴπητε· ἐν-

λογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου—he would both leave the temple, and never again return to it. With this event then the account of transactions on the twelfth of Nisan, *within* the temple, must be concluded.

The particulars subsequent to this, on the same day, were first, the observation made by some one or more of the disciples, as they were passing out of the temple, and personally addressed to our Lord, on the beauty and magnificence of its structure; an observation, memorable not only for the immediate answer which it drew forth from him, but also for its connection with the prophecy on the Mount; which seems to have ultimately been due to it. In this fact all the three Evangelists are agreed. Secondly, the prophecy upon Mount Olivet, delivered as we learn from St. Mark to four of the Apostles, Peter and Andrew, James and John, apart from the rest; and recorded also, either wholly or in part, by each of the same Evangelists. On the harmony of their accounts, however, I could not fully enter at present, without combining the explanation of the prophecy itself; and that is too closely connected with the kindred subject of the parables to be here attempted.

Yet the proceedings on the evening of this day are not, perhaps, completed with the close of this prophecy; for if I mistake not, another incident not less important, and not less distinctly recorded, than any of the rest is still to be referred to it: preparatory to which, however, it is necessary we should first say something on the several accounts of the unction at Bethany. Observing therefore simply that the place and purport of the remark, subjoined to St. Luke's relation of the prophecy^m, are a proof that he considered

^m Ch. xxi. 37. 38.

our Lord's public ministry to have been concluded this day, and consequently with the evening of Wednesday in Passion-week, I shall proceed to that question.

The unction at Bethany is recorded by St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Johnⁿ: between any of whose accounts, and Luke vii. 36—50, where also an unction is related, the difference is, as I think, so palpable and so indisputable, that, notwithstanding the trouble which some learned men have taken to prove them the same, I should consider it a waste of time and argument seriously to prove them distinct*.

It may be regarded as no less certain that each of these accounts is a narrative of the same material fact; or that the unction in St. John was the same event with that in St. Matthew and in St. Mark. So far as they all agree, the identity in question is proved by this agreement; and even where they differ, it is merely on points which must have been purposely omitted by them, and purposely supplied by St. John. The motive to the entertainment, as connected with the miracle of Lazarus; the relation of one of his sisters, Martha, to the master of the house; and the name of the other, Mary, as the agent in the unction; the mention of Judas as either the sole, or the most prominent party in the murmuring ascribed to the disciples, and the motive by which *his* complaint in particular was actuated; these are circumstances altogether passed over by St. Matthew and St. Mark, yet necessary to the historical integrity of the whole narration; and they are all either expressly, or by implication to be found in St. John. Even in the terms of our Saviour's reproof, which had

* Cf. Origen, Operum iii. 892. in Matt. Series 77. which treats D—894. E. or Commentariorum of these several unctions.

ⁿ Matt. xxvi. 6—13. Mark xiv. 3—9. John xii. 2—8.

been the most fully recorded by them, and therefore is the least particularly insisted on by him; he has yet supplied one sentence, at the outset of the address, which, because repeated substantially in the course of it, had probably been omitted by them.

Now the place of the unction in St. John is clearly on the evening of the arrival at Bethany; which, as it has been shewn, according to the Jewish reckoning, was the evening of the ninth of Nisan: its place in St. Matthew, or in St. Mark, is at the close of the proceedings on the twelfth. In this case, if St. John's order is regular, their's it would seem, must be irregular. And yet I shall endeavour to shew that, though *his* order exhibits no Anticipation, neither does *their's* any Trajection.

No account, which happens to be merely introduced in the regular course of events to explain what came to pass at *one* time, though it may itself belong to *another*, can be considered strictly an instance of a Transposition: still less so, where there is such a connection between the two, that the later event was a consequence of the prior. The account of the death of John the Baptist, though it occurred in St. Matthew and in St. Mark, some months after that death, and more than a year after his imprisonment, was yet no irregularity; because it was inserted to explain something which was passing at the time. It was an historical parenthesis, or a recapitulation of the past for the sake of the present; but no Trajection. And this, as it appears to me, is the true statement or description of the Transposition in the present instance also. It was not designed on its own account, but for the sake of a further topic; the history of the treachery of Judas.

This history is divisible into three stages, each of

which has been accurately defined ; the first cause and conception of his purpose ; the overt step towards its execution ; and lastly, its consummation. On none of these points but the first is there any difficulty. The consummation took place in the garden of Gethsemane ; the overt step was the compact with the Sanhedrim ; the first cause and conception of the purpose, if they are to be traced up to any thing on record, must be referred to what happened at the unction in Bethany. There is no evidence that any such design had been formed before Passion-week in general, nor before the time of the supper and the unction during that week in particular. Here, however, the implicit testimony of St. John may justify us in placing it ; and its motive will be that disappointment of the avarice of Judas, on which the Evangelist principally insists ; as well as probably the offence which *he* might take at our Saviour's rebuke, personally levelled against *his* complaints.

Let us suppose then that the design having been now formed, or a sufficient foundation for its formation hereafter having been now laid, the overt step of communicating with the Sanhedrim was taken on the evening of the Wednesday afterwards. If St. Matthew and St. Mark record that step, as they do record it, in its proper place ; viz. upon the day when it was taken ; what was more natural than that they should premise an account of the unction also ? This is precisely the case to which our distinction between a Transposition as such, and a merely historical explanation, would be strikingly apposite. To have related the effect, without specifying the cause, would have been under any circumstances repugnant to the reason of things ; but to have perpetuated the treachery of Judas, without assigning also the motive which led to it, would have been unworthy of the candour of Gospel historians ;

and to suppose a monstrous and unnatural effect (for what could be more so, than the betrayal of Jesus by one of his own Apostles?) without a cause, and much more an adequate cause. It was due to the innocence of our Lord himself, that the baseness of the treacherous disciple's motive, which only could have prompted him to so unnatural an act, should be fitly represented; without exaggeration indeed, yet in its simple and naked atrocity.

The overture of Judas to the Sanhedrim could not have taken place *before* the Wednesday in Passion-week, nor *later* than the Thursday. Both these propositions may be asserted with confidence; the latter because the consummation of his treachery itself ensued early on the morning of the Friday, and there was some interval, after the proposal to the Sanhedrim, during which he was waiting for an opportunity to execute his compact; the former from what is related, in each of these instances, concerning the consultations of the Sanhedrim before^o. They would neither have been deliberating how they might secure possession of the person of Jesus, nor have come to the resolution of attempting nothing against him until after the feast, if Judas had made his overture already. If then this deliberation took place on the evening of the Wednesday, the overture of Judas had not been received before the evening of the Wednesday.

The same conclusion follows from what was so often repeated, at certain times, on the days before, that the enemies of our Lord, had they not been restrained by their fear of the people, would gladly have laid hold upon him on the spot. I conjecture therefore that the overture was made at this critical moment, directly after the

^o Matt. xxvi. 3—5, 14—16. Mark xiv. 1, 2, 10, 11. Luke xxii. 2, 4, 5.

deliberation in question ; when, as removing the only difficulty in the way of their designs, viz. how to lay hands on Jesus δόλφ or covertly, it would be gladly accepted. There was an opportunity for making it, after our Lord had left the temple, and while he was subsequently engaged in the lengthened conversation on the mount, attended by four only of the Apostles, and consequently in the absence of the rest ; which would be as convenient for the purpose of Judas, as if it had been intentionally afforded him. Nor is it improbable that Matt. xxvi. 2, which is immediately subjoined to the close of the prophecy, may contain a significant allusion to the execution of some such purpose at that very time. And, if we consider the state of irritation in which our Saviour had recently left the Sanhedrim, a circumstance which could not be unknown to the traitor, perhaps his cupidity could not have selected a more favourable moment for making the most advantageous bargain.

There can be no objection to this account of the Transposition in St. Matthew and St. Mark, except the supposition that the breast of the Apostle must have harboured his design three or four days before he executed it. But this objection would be frivolous. The mind which could conceive was manifestly capable of harbouring such a design. The crime of Judas could derive no extenuation unless perhaps from the impulse of sudden passion ; and even that cannot be pleaded in its behalf ; for he acted deliberately and with premeditation throughout. He must in any case have been conscious of his purpose, and pondering with himself the means of its execution, long before he carried it into effect. Hence, if passion had ought to do with the first conception of his design, malice and

hardness of heart must have been mainly concerned in its consummation.

I shall conclude, then, by observing briefly that the language and manner of all the Evangelists are in unison with these conclusions. St. Matthew's exordium is to be rendered thus: Now when Jesus was in Bethany; and St. Mark's the same: And as he was in Bethany; where the *καὶ* is equivalent to *δε*. St. Luke, alluding to the design as formed but not yet executed, speaks accordingly: Now Satan had entered into Judas—and he went his way. The *τότε* therefore, Matt. xxvi. 14, is to be referred to xxvi. 5; and the *καὶ*, Mark xiv. 10, to xiv. 2; upon which respectively they would be strictly consecutive: the intermediate matter in each instance being entirely parenthetical. Lastly, had the execution of the purpose of Judas taken place, in any sense, on the same night when it was conceived; if St. John related the circumstances which gave occasion to the conception, he would have mentioned also the effect which arose out of it. His silence therefore as to any such consequences at the time of the unction, may be presumptively an argument that none such followed immediately after the unction. Yet he himself demonstrates plainly that they had happened before the night of the Thursday^p: they had happened therefore sometime between the Saturday and the Thursday.

^p Ch. xiii. 2. II. 26—30.

DISSERTATION XLI.

On the time of the celebration of the last Supper.

THE question which we have now to consider, concerning the time of the celebration of the last supper, is confessedly among the most difficult, if not the most difficult, to which an Harmony of the Gospels is liable.

The nature of the difficulty may be briefly stated as follows: that the night, when our Saviour celebrated *his* Passover, was not the night, when the rest of the Jews celebrated *their's*: and the origin of the difficulty in this instance, as well as in other cases of a like kind, is due to a seeming discrepancy between the existing Evangelical accounts.

The existence of a discrepancy, indeed, on such a subject, if dispassionately considered, ought to be presumptively an argument that the testimony of one of the Gospel historians, rightly ascertained, cannot be really but only seemingly at variance with the testimony of another. The *four* accounts may be virtually reduced to *two*—St. Matthew's and St. John's—St. Mark and St. Luke concurring substantially with the former, and all three, as far as there is any difference among them, differing in common from the latter. Now St. Matthew and St. John were each Apostles, and each a party on this occasion in the celebration of the supper. It is utterly absurd, therefore, to suppose that either could be ignorant of the time, when they and their Master concurred in the performance of this solemnity; and whether that time was the same or not with the time, when the rest of the nation were engaged on a similar festival. It is not less absurd to imagine that, though both

might have known this once, either of them subsequently forgot the truth of the fact; and from inadvertency or from forgetfulness gave an erroneous, or a contradictory account. The circumstances connected with the fact, even humanly speaking, were too memorable in every point of view, not to be indelibly impressed upon their recollection.

It is absolutely certain also, as far as any past fact is capable of being rendered certain, that St. John wrote long after the other Evangelists, and especially after St. Matthew; and was as well aware what account had been given by them on this, or on any other particular of the Gospel history, as we ourselves at present. Common sense and common candour, then, should lead to the inference that, on this point, no insuperable difficulty will be found really to exist; that in setting forth, as the last of the Evangelists, a different account, or what might appear *prima facie* a different account, of the same things, St. John must have known he was not endangering the authority of his predecessors: that the cause of Christian, as well as of historical truth, had nothing to fear from the collision; all the accounts were consistent and true: the later differing from the earlier only in being more explicit, or in determining some things with historical precision which had been merely generally stated before.

That the supper, which our Lord celebrated with the Apostles the night before he suffered, is called and is to be considered, in some sense, as a *Passover*, appears indisputably from Matt. xxvi. 17–20. Mark xiv. 12–17. and Luke xxii. 7–14: but especially from Luke xxii. 15. when the celebration was actually begun. That this was the same supper, as that which begins to be related John xiii. 1. and continues to be related until John xviii. 1. is equally certain both from many com-

mon circumstances belonging to each, and because the event of the supper was the same in each; viz. that Jesus, the same night and after the celebration of this supper, was betrayed.

Yet this supper, at the very commencement of the 13th chapter of St. John, is declared to be *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα*: during its celebration the feast is supposed to be still to come^a: the morning after the supper is called the *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα*^b: the Jews, who brought our Lord that morning to Pilate, would not enter the Prætorium, lest they should be defiled, but *ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα*^c: and in the course of the deliberations, respecting the disposal of Jesus, Pilate speaks of the Passover as either at hand or only just begun that morning, but not yet past^d: Ye have a custom that I should release for you some one at the *Passover*.

The import of all these testimonies is clearly to establish the conclusion that, at the time of the supper the night before, the feast of the Passover was not yet come; and to this effect the first of the number, perhaps, is the most important and the most decisive of any. It is possible to distinguish between the Paschal sacrifice as such, and the feast of unleavened bread. The proper name of the former is *τὸ πάσχα*; the proper name of the latter *τὰ ἄζυμα*^e: the proper time of the former was the fourteenth of the month Nisan; the proper time of the latter from the fifteenth to the twenty-first inclusive. The sacrifice, however, of the Passover was so intimately the prelude to the feast of unleavened bread, and the absence of leaven was so essential a condition to the ceremonial of the Passover itself, that neither the phrase *τὰ ἄζυμα*, or *ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἁζύμων*, can be employed *ἀπλῶς*, without in-

^a Ch. xiii. 29.

^b Ch. xix. 14.

^c Ch. xviii. 28.

^d Ch. xviii. 39.

^e Cf. Origen, ii. 239. A. in Leviticum Homilia ix. 5.

cluding the Paschal supper; nor the phrase τὸ πάσχα, or ἡ ἑορτὴ τοῦ πάσχα, without including the feast of unleavened bread. Much less is it possible that the phrase, ἡ ἑορτὴ τοῦ πάσχα, should be so employed for the feast of unleavened bread in the complex, and not include the feast of the Paschal sacrifice in particular. Such at least is not the usage of St. John, nor of any other of the writers of the New Testament; as the following examples will prove.

Καὶ ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων. John ii. 13—'Εν τῷ πάσχα, ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ. ii. 23—'Εν τῇ ἑορτῇ· καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν. iv. 45—Ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. vi. 4—Ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα . . . πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα. xi. 55—Πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα. xii. 1.

Τὸ πάσχα γίνεται Τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων. Matt. xxvi. 2. 17—Τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα. Mark xiv. 1—Τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων. xiv. 12—Τῇ ἑορτῇ τοῦ πάσχα. Luke ii. 41—Ἦγγιζε δὲ ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων, ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα. xxii. 1—Ἦλθε δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων, ἐν ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα. xxii. 7—Ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων . . . μετὰ τὸ πάσχα. Acts xii. 3. 4—Μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἀζύμων. xx. 6. Compare also 1 Cor. v. 7. and Hebrews xi. 28.

The usage of the writers of the New Testament is in this respect the same with that of the contemporary Jewish author, Josephus; and all together establish this rule, that where the phrase, τὸ πάσχα, is not distinctly opposed to the phrase, τὰ ἄζυμα, they are each inclusive of the other, and the complex, ἑορτὴ τοῦ πάσχα, is absolutely equivalent to the complex, ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων.

Τῆς τῶν ἀζύμων ἐνστάσης ἑορτῆς, Φάσκα παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καλεῖται. Bell. Jud. ii. i. 3—'Επὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν τῶν ἀζύμων. Ib. xii. 1—Τὴν τῶν ἀζύμων ἑορτήν. Ib. 6—Τῆς τῶν

ἄζύμων ἑορτῆς ἐνστάσης. Ib. xiv. 3—Κατὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν τῶν ἄζύμων. iv. vii. 2—Τῆς τῶν ἄζύμων ἐνστάσης ἡμέρας, τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῃ Ξανθικοῦ μηνός. v. iii. 1—Πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἄζύμων ἑορτὴν. vi. v. 3—Ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ἄζύμων ἑορτὴν . . . ἐνστάσης ἑορτῆς· πάσχα καλεῖται. Ib. ix. 3.

“Ὅθεν νῦν ἔτι κατὰ τὸ ἔθος οὕτως θύομεν, τὴν ἑορτὴν πάσχα καλοῦντες· σημαίνει δὲ ὑπερβασία. Ant. Jud. ii. xiv. 6—“Ὅθεν εἰς μνήμην τῆς τότε ἐνδείας ἑορτὴν ἄγομεν ἐφ’ ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ, τὴν τῶν ἄζύμων λεγομένην. Ib. xv. 1—Τῷ δὲ μὲν τῷ Ξανθικῷ . . . τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῃ κατὰ σελήνην . . . τὴν θυσίαν . . . πάσχα λεγομένην . . . θύειν ἐνομίσε . . . πέμπτη δὲ καὶ δεκάτῃ διαδέχεται τὴν τοῦ πάσχα ἢ τῶν ἄζύμων ἑορτῇ. Ib. iii. x. 5—Θύει δὲ τότε πρῶτον . . . τὴν πάσχα λεγομένην. Ib. xii. 6—Κατὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν τῶν ἄζύμων. Ib. xv. 3—Τὴν Φάσκα ἐώρταζον. v. i. 4—Τὴν τῶν ἄζύμων ἑορτὴν ἄζοντα—Ἐνστάσης δὲ τῆς τῶν ἄζύμων ἑορτῆς, θύσαντες τὴν λεγομένην πάσχα. ix. xiii. 2. 3—Τὴν ἄζύμων ἑορτὴν, καὶ τὴν πάσχα λεγομένην. x. iv. 5—Ἐνστάσης δὲ τῆς τῶν ἄζύμων ἑορτῆς . . . καὶ τὴν πάσχα προσαγορευομένην θυσίαν. xi. iv. 8—Κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς τῶν ἄζύμων ἑορτῆς, ἣν Φάσκα λέγομεν—Τὴν ἑορτὴν . . . τὴν καλουμένην Φάσκα. xiv. ii. 1. 2—Ἐνστάσης . . . ἑορτῆς, ἐν ἣ Ἰουδαίους ἄζυμα προτίθεσθαι πάτριον· πάσχα δὲ ἡ ἑορτὴ καλεῖται. xvii. ix. 3—Τῶν ἄζύμων τῆς ἑορτῆς ἀγομένης, ἣν πάσχα καλοῦμεν—Ἦν αὐτοῖς ἑορτὴ· πάσχα δὲ καλεῖται. xviii. ii. 2. iv. 3—Τῆς πάσχα προσαγορευομένης ἑορτῆς ἐνστάσης, καθ’ ἣν ἔθος ἐστὶν ἡμῖν ἄζυμα προσφέρεισθαι. xx. v. 3.

With respect to Philo Judeus, though he commonly expresses the Hebrew Pascha by its equivalent Greek term, ἡ διάβασις, or τὰ διαβατήρια, the same usage is observable in him also. Διὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς διαβάσεως αὐτῶν, ὃ καλεῖται πάσχα: i. 117. l. 31. SS. Legum Allego-
riarum iii. Vide also Ibid. 174. l. 25—35. De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini. Οὗ χάριν διείρηται καὶ ἐπὶ πικρίδων τὰ ἄζυμα ἐσθίειν: Ibid. 542. l. 45. De Congressu quæ-

rendæ eruditionis gratia—Τετάρτη δὲ, τῶν διαβατηρίων, ἣ καλεῖται πᾶσχα . . . ἔκτη δ', ἄζυμα—Συνάπτει δὲ . . . τοῖς διαβατηρίοις ἑορτῇ, διάφορον ἔχουσα καὶ οὐ συνήθη τῆς τροφῆς χρῆσιν, ἄζυμα, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ὠνόμασται : ii. 278. l. 20—22 ; 293. l. 1—3. De Septenario et Festis Diebus.

In like manner Ezechiel Tragicus, as quoted by Eusebius in the ninth book of his Evangelica Præparatio.

Λέξεις δὲ λαῶ παντί· Μηνὸς οὗ λέγω
διχομηνία τὸ πᾶσχα θύσαντας Θεῷ
τῆς πρόσθε νυκτός, αἵματι ψαῦσαι θύρας.

Lib. ix. cap. 29. 443. A.

And again,

Ἀφ' ἧσπερ ἡοῦς ἐφύγετ', Αἰγύπτου γ' ἀπο
ἐπτα διοδοιποροῦντες ἡμερῶν ὁδόν,
πάντες τοσαύτας ἡμέρας ἔτος κατά
ἄζυμ' ἔδεσθε, καὶ Θεῷ λατρεύετε.

Ibid. B.

And again,

Ταύτην δ' ἑορτὴν Δεσπότη τηρήσετε
ἔφθ' ἡμέρας, ἄζυμα, κοῦ βρωθήσεται
ζύμη.

Ibid. D. 444. A.

In order to remove the difficulty in question, or to reconcile the express testimony of St. John with the apparent testimony of the other Evangelists, most commentators have supposed either that our Lord with his disciples anticipated by one whole day the regular time of the Passover ; or that a part of the Jews, with whom he concurred, kept their Passover on one day, and the rest, with whom he differed, kept their's on the next. To those who should maintain that there was no difference in this respect between him and the Jews at large, or that all kept their Passover alike, viz. on the night before Jesus suffered, what has been proved concerning the signification of πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πᾶσχα, standing absolutely in St. John's Gospel, must be a sufficient answer. In defence of the same opinion they are obliged also to give a novel and an untenable sense

to the same word, in the other instances of its occurrence, ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα—and, ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα: and that too not the same sense in both, but as much at variance, the one with the other, as either with the truth of the case.

In the first they would restrict the word to the sacrifices which made a part of the ceremonial of the seven days' feast, distinct from the sacrifice of the Passover itself; grounding this construction on Deut. xvi. 2, and forgetting that, whereas there is but this *one* text, either in the Old or in the New Testament, where the word *Passover* might be interpreted in this catachrestic sense, there are innumerable passages in both where it can be construed only properly. This very text is understood by Maimonides^e to denote the *peace-offerings*, which were required to accompany the Passover on the fourteenth day of the month; in which case, though these might be intended here, yet on the morning of our Saviour's crucifixion both they and the Passover would either both be over, or both still to come; over, if the Passover had been celebrated already; to come, if the Passover was to be celebrated that evening.

But whatever the terms τὸ πάσχα, standing by themselves, could be shewn to mean, this would be of little avail upon the point at issue, unless it could be also proved that the phrase which is actually here employed, τὸ φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα, is ever used of any thing but eating the Paschal sacrifice as such. Those, who by the Law would be bound to eat of any sacrifices during this feast in particular, distinct from that, would be the Priests or the Levites. During the seven days of the ἄζυμα as such, says Josephus, καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν, ταῦροι σφάττονται δύο, καὶ κριὸς μὲν εἷς, ἐπτὰ δὲ ἄρνες. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὀλοκαυτοῦται, προστιθεμένου τοῖς πάσι

^e De Sacrificio Paschali, x. 12.

καὶ ἐρίφον, ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτάνων, εἰς εὐωχίαν κατὰ ἡμέραν ἐκάστην τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν^f. And again, ταύτας . . . (sc. τὰς ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτάνων θυσίας) ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ μόνοι δαπανῶσιν οἱ ἄρρένες τῶν ἱερέων αὐθημερόν^g. Now those who conducted our Lord to Pilate it cannot be proved were exclusively Priests or Levites. On the contrary, according to St. John's account, whatever share in his deduction the members of the Sanhedrim also might have taken, they must have been among others the parties who first apprehended him—ἡ σπεῖρα, καὶ ὁ χιλιάρχος, καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται^h: and these in particular could have had no motive to deter them from entering into the judgment-hall of a Gentile magistrate, except the ordinary dread of such pollution as would have prevented their taking part in any ceremony of the Law, which like the Paschal feast required them to be *clean*. And that contact with a Gentile might have produced such pollution is too well known to need any proof.

In the second instance, it may be admitted that the word παρασκευή, standing absolutely, might be understood to denote προσάββατον: and such is its meaning in the phrase, παρασκευὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, John xix. 31. 42, which follows afterwards. This παρασκευή, according to Josephus, began on the day before the sabbath, with the ninth hourⁱ: ἐν σάββασιν, ἢ τῇ πρὸ ταύτης παρασκευῇ, ἀπὸ ὥρας ἐνάτης: which explains at once the propriety of Mark xv. 42; ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή, ὃ ἐστὶ προσάββατον—and the meaning of Matt. xxvii. 62; τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον, ἥτις ἐστὶ μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν—or of Luke xxiii. 54; καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευή, καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκε—where this verb has its secondary sense of *was coming on*, not, *was dawning*.

In the complex, παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, however, it is

^f Ant. Jud. iii. x. 5.
Jud. xvi. vi. 2.

^g Ibid. iv. iv. 4.

^h xviii. 12. 28.

ⁱ Ant.

by no means certain that the phrase can bear the simple sense of *προσάββατον*. The Passover was of importance enough to have a period, called its *παρασκευή*, appropriated to it exclusively. As equivalent to *προσάββατον*, that period would be limited to between the ninth hour, or three in the afternoon, on the Friday, and sunset; but the *παρασκευή τοῦ πάσχα*, according to St. John^k, had begun either as early as six in the morning, or not later than twelve at noon. Though, however, even in the complex, it might bear the simple sense of *προσάββατον*; how would that prove the Passover to have been kept already, and at the usual time? *Προσάββατον τοῦ πάσχα*, if it denotes the *day before the Paschal sabbath*, means either the day before the *fifteenth*, or the day before the *twenty-first*, of Nisan, both which, whensoever they might fall, were by the appointment of the Law to be kept as sabbaths, and, consequently, were strictly the *Paschal sabbaths*¹. The day before the twenty-first, I apprehend, must be out of all question; and the day before the fifteenth is the *fourteenth*, the very day of the Passover itself.

But if *προσάββατον τοῦ πάσχα* does not mean the day before a Paschal sabbath as such, what can it mean but the day *before the sabbath ἀπλῶς*? and how could that be confounded with the day before the sabbath in *the Paschal week*—which would be a specific designation? We might as well contend that *σάββατον*, standing alone, would denote the ordinary sabbath of the Paschal week, as that *προσάββατον* would the ordinary day before that. The *προσάββατον* is merely so much of the *sixth* day of the week, as was in any way devoted to preparation against the *seventh*; which, consequently, might always be express and intelligible,

^k Ch. xix. 14.¹ Exod. xii. 16. Lev. xxiii. 7, 8. Numb. xxviii. 18, 25.

with reference to that day as such—but not to that day, as one of the days of the Paschal feast. If the phrase *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα* were equivalent, in this sense, to the phrase *προσάββατον τοῦ πάσχα*, it would require to be rendered as follows, and unless so rendered it would not be understood: The preparatory part of the Friday before the Saturday in the Paschal week—than which, what can be further from the proper sense of the terms? Yet even this explanation, harsh as it is, will not hold good in the present instance, except at the expense of a still greater absurdity; which is that of making any part of *one* sabbath preparatory to *another*. The Friday in the Paschal week is supposed, upon this principle, to have been the fifteenth of Nisan; and the fifteenth of Nisan, whensoever it fell, was a sabbath. The preparation on this Friday, then, with a view to the Saturday, would be the preparation on *one* sabbath with a view to the arrival of *another*: than which conclusion there cannot be a greater inconsistency either with the nature of terms, or with the nature of things. For the preparation was necessarily part of a *dies profestus*—and never of a sabbath.

We have still, therefore, to choose only between the two alternatives stated above: with respect to which, could it be shewn that, on so important a subject, as the time of celebrating the first and most cardinal festival in their calendar, any schism or misunderstanding could possibly prevail among the Jews; more especially any such schism or misunderstanding, as might arise from an inability to compute the days of the month aright, so that what one party reckoned to be the lunar fourteenth of Nisan was really the lunar fifteenth, or *vice versa*; if the astronomical canons, the oral testimony, or the actual phasis of the new moon, by which the

first day of this month was wont to be fixed, were liable to mislead; or if they were capable of misleading *once*, that they might not mislead repeatedly; if the influence of the Pharisees, who are supposed to have decided upon a wrong day, was not at this time altogether paramount, so as even to have given public sanction to an error; or, if in fact there was any material difference of opinion, upon this point at least, between them and the Sadducees, the Karaites, or any other sect; could these things, I say, be proved, the explanation of the present difficulty, which proceeds upon them, might be entitled to some attention.

But until this can be done, we have no option except to embrace the remaining alternative, which assumes that our Lord in particular antedated, by one day, the true time of the Passover: and if it can be made to appear that he had special reasons for so doing—reasons, which rendered it absolutely impossible that he could keep the Passover at its usual time on the occasion before he suffered—the truth of this alternative may be considered as sufficiently established. Although therefore, the existence of the present difficulty has exercised, more than any one thing, the sagacity and ingenuity of commentators, so that little, perhaps, remains to be said either on one side or on the other; I shall proceed to state what arguments may be urged in support of the opinion in question; but with as much conciseness and perspicuity as possible.

I take it for granted that the legal period, at which only the Passover could be duly celebrated, was the fourteenth of the month Abib, Nisan, or Xanthicus, *κατὰ σελήνην*^t; and consequently that the question is,

^t Exod. xii. xiii. 4—8. xxiii. 15. xxxiv. 18. Lev. xxiii. 5—8. Numb. ix. 2. 3. xxviii. 16—25. xxxiii. 3. Deut. xvi. 1—8. Josh. v. 10. 11. 2 Chron. xxix. xxx. 1—3. 15. 21. xxxv. 1—19. Ezra vi. 19.

whether our Lord celebrated it on this day or on the day before it; on the fourteenth, or on the thirteenth of the month prescribed. As to the day of the week there can be no uncertainty. It was the day before he suffered; and that day was Friday: *his* Passover therefore was kept on the night of the Thursday.

First then in St. Matthew's account of our Saviour's message to the man in the city, the particular stress which is laid upon the circumstance $\delta \kappa α ι ρ ό ς μ ο υ ἐ γ γ ύ ς ἐ σ τ ι$ ^u, may justly be considered to imply that the Passover, about to be celebrated, was something out of course. The man, to whom the message was sent, was probably a believer in Christ; or our Saviour would not address him in such terms as *the Master* saith. Now the injunction of the Law, and the invariable practice of the Jews, both required that the Passover should be kept *within* Jerusalem; and our Lord manifestly complies with each so far as to send his disciples to make ready for him *in* the city. But when it is considered that the resort of strangers, at the seasons of the feasts and in peaceful times, was such as many times to double its ordinary population; it will be evident that, for the accommodation of so great an influx of visitors, the houses of the regular inhabitants must all have been thrown open to their reception. Μυρίοι γὰρ ἀπὸ μυρίων ὄσων πόλεων, οἱ μὲν διὰ γῆς, οἱ δὲ διὰ θαλάττης, ἐξ ἀνατολῆς καὶ δύσεως, καὶ ἄρκτου καὶ μεσημβρίας, καθ' ἐκάστην ἑορτὴν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καταίρουσιν^v. And that this is no exaggerated description appears from the numbers assembled at the Passovers U.C. 819. and U. C. 823. respectively^w—the former of which as we shall see elsewhere amounted to two or three millions, and the latter to more than one million. It was an ἔθος πατριον, says Josephus^x, to receive into Jerusalem,

^u Ch. xxvi. 18.

^v Philo Judæus, ii. 223. l. 15—18. De Monarchia ii.

^w Vide the Appendix.

^x Bell. iv. iii. 3.

πάν τὸ ὁμόφυλον ἀπαρτηρήτως. Nor was even this facility of admission, at such times as those of the Passovers, sufficient for the reception and entertainment of all parties, without the further necessity of forming themselves into *φρατρίαι*, sodalities, companies, or households; varying from ten to twenty in number.

The message of our Lord, then, though sent to an householder in Jerusalem, announcing in his own name and in that of his Twelve disciples, that he meant to keep the Passover at his house; if sent at the regular time, would have been nothing extraordinary. It was what any one, under such circumstances, might have undertaken to send: the right of admission into some house within the city belonged to every stranger, whether from Judæa, from Galilee, or from abroad, who came up to attend the feast. What necessity, then, for an *especial* reason—or even for any reason at all—in claiming it now? and why should not the simple notification of our Lord's wish, if made at the regular season and in the regular manner, have been sufficient, particularly for a disciple?

It is impossible to understand his *time*, or rather his *season*, of any thing but the season of his passion; that determinate period which St. John so often and so emphatically denominates his *hour*. If this season was the following day, and also the season of the Passover, then, if under such circumstances our Saviour proposed to keep his Passover at all, he must keep it at an unusual time; if he must keep it at an unusual time, he would select the house of some believer in himself; and in sending a preparatory message to a believer, he might assign such a reason as this—My time is at hand—I am to suffer to-morrow—and, therefore, though it is before the usual period, I shall keep my Passover with thee to-night. A disciple of or believer in Christ would neither dispute his

commands, nor question the propriety of his conduct. Hence it is, that the Apostles themselves appear to have been already aware of his purpose; and taking it for granted that he *would* keep his Passover that night, they come to him in each of the Evangelists simply to inquire in what place. There is no difficulty in conceiving that he had previously acquainted them with his intentions on the morning of the Thursday; or even on the night of the Wednesday.

If we are to believe the testimony of Philo Judæus, the master of every household, or some one fit person in the name and on the behalf of a particular Paschal company, which in the present instance would be Peter or John, without having recourse to the ministry of the regular priesthood, was empowered to act as his own priest—and consequently, as we may presume, at home, not in the temple—for the immolation of his peculiar Paschal victim. This testimony is so express, and as coming from a contemporary Jew, who had often partaken in the ceremony himself, is so justly entitled to credit, that it ought to outweigh an host of the rabbinical writers, who certainly give a different account; which shall be my excuse with the reader, if I transcribe it at full length.

I. Τῷ δὴ μὲν τούτῳ, περὶ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτην ἡμέραν, μέλλοντος τοῦ σεληνιακοῦ κύκλου γίνεσθαι πλησιφαοῦς, ἄγεται τὰ διαβατήρια, δημοφανὴς ἑορτὴ, τὸ Χαλδαῖστί λεγόμενον πάσχα· ἐν ᾗ οὐχ οἱ μὲν ἰδιῶται προσάγουσι τῷ βωμῷ τὰ ἱερεῖα, θύουσι δὲ οἱ ἱερεῖς, ἀλλὰ νόμου προστάξει σύμπαν τὸ ἔθνος ἱερᾶται, τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐκάστου τὰς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ θυσίας ἀνάγοντος τότε, καὶ χειρουργοῦντος^γ.

II. Καὶ ἦν Ἑβραῖοι, πατρίῳ γλώττῃ, πάσχα προσαγορεύουσιν· ἐν ᾗ θύουσι πανδημεὶ αὐτῶν ἕκαστος, τοὺς ἱερεῖς αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀναμένοντες· ἱερωσύνην τοῦ νόμου χαρισμένου τῷ

^γ Operum ii. 169. l. 16—24. De Mose, iii.

ἐθνεῖ παντὶ μίαν ἡμέραν ἐξαίρετον, ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος, εἰς αὐτουργίαν θυσιῶν^z.

III. Μετὰ δὲ νουμηνίαν ἐστὶν ἑορτὴ τετάρτη, τὰ διαβατήρια, ἣν οἱ Ἑβραῖοι πάσχα καλοῦσιν· ἐν ἣ θύουσι πανδημεὶ, ἀρξάμενοι κατὰ μεσημβρίαν, ἕως ἐσπέρας . . . ἱερεῖς οὐκ ἀναμένοντες. τὸ δὲ τότε (sc. at the time of the first Passover) πραχθὲν δρᾶν ἐφῆκεν ὁ νόμος ἅπαξ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἕκαστον, εἰς εὐχαριστίας ὑπόμνησιν...ἐκάστη δὲ οἰκία, κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον, σχῆμα ἱεροῦ καὶ σεμνότητα περιβέβληται, τοῦ σφαγιασθέντος ἱερείου πρὸς τὴν ἀρμόττουσαν εὐωχίαν εὐτρεπιζομένου, καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τὰ συσσίτια συνειλεγμένων ἀγνευτικοῖς περιρῥαντηρίοις κεκαθαρμένων· οἱ παραγεγόνασιν οὐχ ὥς εἰς τᾶλλα συμπόσια, χαριούμενοι γαστρὶ δι' οἴνου καὶ ἐδεσμάτων, ἀλλὰ πάτριον ἔθος ἐκπληρώσοντες, μετ' εὐχῆς τε καὶ ὕμνων. ἄγεται δὲ ἡ πάνδημος θυσία τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνός^{* a}.

* The account of Josephus, Ant. Jud. ii. xiv. 6. iii. x. 5, or Bell. vi. ix. 3, is not at variance with this testimony of Philo's. The estimation of the number of Paschal communicants, from the number of Paschal victims, in the way described by the last of these passages, would still be possible. Each of those victims might be taken up in the name of a particular Paschal company, and kept in the quarter where the lambs, intended for sacrifice, were usually taken up and kept; viz. in the *conclave agnorum*, within the temple. By this means their tale or number might be calculated.

The account of the Passover kept by Hezekiah, 2 Chron. xxx. 15—17, leads presumptively to a similar conclusion: for it would not be mentioned as something

extraordinary, that the Levites had the charge of killing the Passovers for every one that was not *clean*, had it not been usual for such as were clean to kill their own. 2 Chron. xxxv. 7, 8, 9, also, the Passover-offerings for the people as such, for the priests as such, and for the Levites as such, are all mentioned distinctly; and at verse 11. it is said *ἀπλῶς they killed*; but with respect to the priests and the Levites, only that the *former* sprinkled the blood from *their* hands, and the *latter* flayed the victims. Perhaps this was the whole which was done at any time. The people themselves slew the victims; but brought the blood to be sprinkled by the priests. Ezra vi. 20. may be understood of such of the people as were not clean.

^z Operum ii. 206. l. 16—22. De Decem Oraculis.
44. De Septenario et Festis Diebus.

^a Ibid. 292. l. 16—

The circumstances of the first Passover (Exod. xii. 6.) must evidently have been such as Philo describes; and if we consider the vast multitude of victims which were required to be sacrificed on such occasions, a multitude which Josephus computed at 256,500 *, and the short space of time within which they must all have been sacrificed, which he states likewise at merely *two* hours, ἀπὸ ἐννάτης ὥρας, μέχρι ἐνδεκάτης; it is utterly impossible that so many could be offered within such a time, unless all were offered at once; that is, unless every master of a family was sacrificing and preparing his own victim at the same moment with another. I have been the more diffuse on this subject, with a view to anticipate a possible objection; viz. how our Lord could have celebrated *his* Paschal supper, out of the usual course, without attracting any particular notice. The existence of the custom in

* This computation itself is probably below the truth; for 256,500, multiplied by ten, would produce the sum only of 2,565,000: as the amount of the persons who must have partaken in the Passover of U. C. 819, which Josephus states at 2,700,000. And that this statement is not beyond the truth may be collected from Bell. ii. xiv. 3, where the same amount is represented at not less than three millions. Now it is very possible that the precise sum of 2,565,000 might be called in round numbers, 2,600,000; but I do not see how, without a very great inaccuracy, it could be called 2,700,000; one hundred and thirty-five thousand beyond the truth. Unless, then, we should suppose that Josephus has fallen into this inaccuracy,

it is necessary to conceive that he originally wrote either 2,600,000 which was afterwards corrupted into 2,700,000, for the number of persons: or, 266,500, which was afterwards corrupted into 256,500, for the number of victims. And this last is the more probable state of the case; for if the calculation in each instance was expressed by multiples of myriads, it was much easier for κς'. μυριάδες (which would denote 260,000) to have been corrupted into κε'. μυριάδες, equivalent to 250,000, than for σξ'. μυριάδες (2,600,000) to have been corrupted into σδ'. μυριάδες (2,700,000). It is possible that ς'. might be converted into ε': but it is not so conceivable that ξ'. would ever be confounded with δ'.

question rendered it easy so to do, unknown to any but confidential persons, the master of the house, and his own disciples.

Secondly, though the Sanhedrim, in their consultation on the evening of Wednesday^b, came to the resolution indeed of putting Jesus to death, yet they concluded also not to effect the resolution, at least during the feast; ἵνα μὴ θόρυβος γένοιτο ἐν τῷ λαῷ. The feast, as it would be useless to deny, must have been begun when the Passover day was arrived and past: hence if Jesus was apprehended on the day after that, he must have been apprehended in the midst of the feast. Where, however, is the proof of any intermediate change in the resolution of the Sanhedrim, which had come to a contrary conclusion? It cannot be said that the overture of Judas, though made directly afterwards, produced it; for that overture would rather confirm than alter the preexisting determination. The object of the Sanhedrim was twofold; to get possession of Jesus δόλω first, and to put him to death afterwards: and what they were at a loss about for a time was the first of these two things. The proposal of Judas, being the offer of a confidential disciple to betray his Master, clearly removed the difficulty upon this head: but they must still have stipulated with him that he should effect his engagement as secretly as possible, or St. Matthew, St. Mark, and especially St. Luke, would not say that, after concluding it, ἐξήτει ἐνκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς ἄτερ ὄχλου^c: which means, without trouble, tumult, or disturbance; and not, without a multitude, much less, *the* multitude.

The original precaution, then, of not attempting the apprehension of Jesus during the feast, or in the open day before the people, was not abandoned even at last; as

^b Matt. xxvi. 3—5. Mark xiv. 1, 2. ^c Luke xxii. 6.

the very circumstances of the apprehension itself prove. And this would still be in unison with the event, if our Lord was arrested on the night of the Thursday, and put to death on the morning of the Friday; before the feast was yet begun. *Causas capitales*, says Maimonides, *absolvunt eodem die ad innocentiam, sed postero ad culpam*^d; that is, a criminal was to be tried on one day and executed on the next: and even this principle of Jewish jurisprudence seems to have been observed as far as the nature of the emergency would permit; our Lord having been tried in the night-time, and not delivered over to the governor until the morning.

The Divine Providence might so order it, that the proposal of Judas should be made to the Sanhedrim *before* the feast, and neither during it nor after it; and the same Providence might likewise so order it, that the necessary opportunity for effecting his purpose should occur the very night before the feast, and neither earlier nor later. Now when he went out, as we shall see hereafter, upon receiving the sop, the night was somewhat advanced, but the Paschal ceremony was far from being over: and he went out, as the rest of the company supposed, to buy what was wanted against the feast. He would go, then, as they supposed to the shops, or where such things were to be procured. If so, neither could it have been late in the evening on any day, nor could it have been the evening of the Passover on that day in particular. After sunset, on the evening of the Passover, both because of the sabbath which would then have begun, and because of the celebration of the Passover which would be going on, no shop would be open in Jerusalem, nor any dealings of buying or selling any longer practicable: all

^d De Jurejurando, xi. 8. Dithmari Annot.

persons, both old and young, both male and female, both the inhabitants and the stranger, would then be simultaneously engaged until midnight at least; if they went out of their houses even before morning.

It is certain, however, that Judas must have gone straight to the Sanhedrim, expecting to have access to it; and as he received from the Sanhedrim the force with which he accomplished his purpose, it is certain also that he must have obtained access to it. The members of that council, therefore, were either assembled at the time of his arrival, or easily got together afterwards; which renders it exceedingly improbable that they were previously engaged on their respective Passovers. The same thing is true of the band; all of whom, the cohort, the captains, and the servants, we may take it for granted, consisted of Jews; the former, of those who had the custody of the temple, the latter, of officers of the Sanhedrim. If so, these too would be bound to keep the Passover that night; and unless it had been already kept, or unless they had been purposely disturbed while keeping it, they could not have come on such an errand as this that night: it is not even probable that they would have been sent upon it. The young man also, spoken of by St. Mark, would not have been alone on the Paschal night, when all Jerusalem was divided into companies; nor abroad, so soon after midnight at the latest, when all those companies were in their respective homes. Nor would it, I think, have been expressly mentioned, that they, who brought our Saviour to the palace of the high priest, after they had brought him thither, made a fire on purpose against the cold: for if the night when they brought him had been the Paschal night, every household on that night must have sat up until a late hour, and fires would have been found burning all through

it. These circumstances may appear trifling ; but even these, on *one* hypothesis, will all be consistent and natural, and on the contrary supposition, inconsistent and unnatural. Nor can any hypothesis be true which does not account for every thing ; nor accord with the least matters of fact as much as with the greatest. It is the criterion of truth alone, to apply alike to both.

Thirdly, the attempts of Pilate to procure the release of our Lord were produced partly by a conviction of the innocence of Jesus, and partly by the necessity of compliance with a certain privilege of the feast. Into the origin of this privilege we have no data which would enable us to inquire. It could not be more ancient than the time of Coponius, when Judæa was first reduced to the form of a Roman province ; and very probably did not continue longer than the time of Pilate ; on whose demise the Jews became subject not to any new Roman procurator, but to a native king : nor is it unlikely that it both began and ended with the reign of Tiberius in particular*.

Its nature, however, is very well ascertained by the language of the Evangelists themselves. Κατὰ ἑορτήν, which means *at every feast*, or *feast by feast*, implies that the people had a right to the liberation of *some one prisoner*, of their own choosing, at the other two great solemnities as well as at the Passover. It was now the feast of the Passover, and Pilate reminded them of their privilege accordingly^e ; and they themselves,

* From the notice which is thus taken of the fact, we may infer that none of the Gospel-historians, not even St. Matthew, wrote before the privilege had fallen into disuse. If so, St. Matthew did not write before the first of Caius, U.C. 790 ; that is, for the first seven years after the Ascension, at least.

as the other Evangelists testify, began shortly afterwards to press him to do for them as he had ever been accustomed to do*. The jealousy with which the common people would naturally watch over such a privilege, the violence which had been probably committed by Pilate not long before, the notoriety, and perhaps the popularity of Barabbas, in whose favour they desired its exercise, are presumptive reasons why they would not be slow to insist upon the recognition of their right. But they could not have demanded it before the feast was begun, though they might not delay to demand it as soon as it was. When, therefore, were they so likely to demand it as on the first day of the feast itself? If so, the day of our Lord's crucifixion, when they did demand it, was the day when the feast began; that is, the fourteenth of Nisan; for the feast could begin on no day but that.

On the same day, about the third hour, as the soldiers were conducting Jesus to Calvary, and either as they were coming out of the Prætorium of Pilate, or leaving the gate of the city, they fell in with Simon of Cyrene entering Jerusalem ἀπ' ἀγροῦ: whom they compelled to assist in carrying his cross. This mention of a Jew, a native of Cyrene in Africa, and consequently a Jew of the Dispersion; a stranger from a distant region, yet coming to Jerusalem, at this critical juncture, from abroad; appears to me designed to intimate the

* And this circumstance, we may observe by the way, is a proof that Pilate had been some years in office before our Saviour was thus tried before him. It is fatal, therefore, to any such hypothesis as that of Mr. Mann; which makes our Saviour's ministry last only one year, and places its termination in the thir-

teenth of Tiberius Cæsar. At the Passover in the thirteenth of Tiberius Cæsar, Pilate, as I have proved elsewhere, (vide Dissertation ix. vol. i.) had been only six months in office; and had witnessed at the utmost but two solemnities, the feast of Tabernacles and the Encænïa, before that very Passover itself.

arrival of such a Jew, to keep the Passover the same day. For according to Maimonides^f, *Decima et quarta die mensis Nisan, ad solis ortum, si quis abesset ab urbe Hierosolyma milliaria quindecim, aut eo plus, id sane longum iter erat: qui vero minus spatii abesset, nequaquam longo itinere remotus erat, quippe qui poterat Hierosolymam advenire paulo post meridiem, tametsi placide pedibus iret.* It would not, therefore, be too late for such an one to keep the Passover that same day.

Fourthly, if our arrangement of the preceding days of the week be correct, the course of particulars closed with the evening of Wednesday, and with the prophecy on the mount. At the end of that prophecy the following words were subjoined^g; And it came to pass when Jesus had made an end of all these sayings, that he said to his disciples, Ye know that after two days the Passover taketh place, and the Son of Man is delivered up to be crucified. Now *two* days from the evening of Wednesday cannot possibly denote a less time than the day but one after; that is, the Friday following^h. Unless, then, it can be shewn that we were wrong in supposing these words to have been spoken on the Wednesday; that is, in supposing the day of our Lord's procession to the temple to have been the Monday; the argument, deducible from the authority of this passage, that the Passover would take place on the Friday, and consequently that the Friday was the fourteenth of Nisan, amounts to a demonstration.

It cannot be questioned that the Passover spoken of is the stated and regular ceremony, so called: and I think it is just as certain that the delivering up to be crucified, also spoken of, is that last and final act in

^f De Sacrificio Paschali, v. 9. Vide also Mishna ii. 168. 2. ^g Matt. xxvi. 1. 2. ^h Cf. Origen, *Operum* iii. 891. A—E. or *Comm. in Matt.* Series 75.

the trial of our Lord, when Pilate made him over to the hands of his executioners. This act both St. Matthew and St. Mark, with an exact accordance to the words of the prediction, express alike by *παρέδωκεν ἵνα σταυρωθῇ*^h. The betrayal by Judas, though the first step in the whole proceeding, was no delivering up to be crucified; nor is ever spoken of as such, but merely as a delivering up into the hands of sinners: it was not even, at least in the expectation of the betrayer himself, a delivering up to be put to death at all; otherwise he would not have been surprised at the event, nor have repented when he saw that Jesus was condemned.

When we consider, therefore, that our Lord couples these two things, the taking place of the Passover and his own delivering up to be crucified, as simultaneous; then if either was to happen at the distance of two days afterwards, so we may presume was the other likewise. Now it is certain that this was the case with one of them, his being delivered up. Conversely also, if either was to happen on the Friday, two days after, the prediction of either, two days before, must have been pronounced on the Wednesday. The matter of fact shews that our Lord's crucifixion was to happen on Friday; his own prediction that the Passover was to happen two days from the Wednesday: both together shew that each was to happen at the same time with the other.

Fifthly, the strictness with which, at this period of their history, and indeed at every period before, when the Law possessed its due force, the Jews observed the sabbath, must be among the strongest presumptive disproofs, amounting to a moral impossibility, that any one of the numerous particulars, connected with the

^h Ch. xxvii. 26. xv. 15.

apprehension, the examination, the judgment, and the execution of our Lord, could take place on that day. It is well known that for a time they would not defend their lives on the sabbath day, nor afterwards, except in case of an attackⁱ. On more than one occasion the capture of Jerusalem was mainly due to this single cause; and the folly of the Jews, in that respect, as it was considered by the Gentiles, appeared most unaccountable, and exposed them to constant sarcasm and reproach^{*k}. Both the arrival and the expiration of the sabbatic rest were formally notified to the people by the sound of a trumpet; that they might know

* Yet in the time of Josephus, such was the effect produced by the dispersion of the Jews, and such their success in gaining over proselytes, that the observance of the sabbath, even among the Gentiles, was universal. Οὐδ' ἔστιν οὐ πόλις Ἑλλήνων οὐδητισοῦν, οὐδὲ βάρβαρος, οὐδὲ ἐν ἔθνος, ἔνθα μὴ τὸ τῆς ἐβδομάδος, ἣν ἀργοῦμεν ἡμεῖς, τὸ ἔθος οὐ διαπεφοίτηκε^l. Cf. Philo ii. 137. 38. De Mose ii: τίς γὰρ τὴν ἱερὰν ἐκείνην ἐβδόμην οὐκ ἐκτετμήκεν, κ', τ. λ. Seneca, also, (apud Augustinum, De Civitate Dei, vi. 11. Operum vii. 160. F. G:) Cum interim usque eo sceleratissimæ gentis consuetudo convaluit, ut per omnes jam terras recepta sit: victi victoribus leges dederunt. Hence these allusions to the sabbath in Tibullus and Ovid: Aut ego sum causatus aves, aut omina dira, | Saturni aut sacram me tenuisse diem: Tibullus, i. iii. 17. Nec te prætereat Veneri ploratus

Adonis; | Cultaque Judæo septima sacra Syro: Ovid, De arte Amandi, i. 75. Quaque die redeunt, rebus minus apta gerendis, | Culta Palæstino septima festa Syro: Ibid. 415. Nec pluvias vites; nec te peregrina morrentur | Sabbata; nec damnis Allia nota suis: Remedia Amoris, 219.

Vide also Horace, Sermonum i. ix. 69. Persius, v. 179, 180. If we may believe Seneca, even that peculiar article of Jewish strictness, the not lighting a fire on the sabbath day, was come into vogue at Rome: Accendere aliquem lucernam sabbathis prohibeamus. Epistolæ, 95. §. 47. In like manner, Meleager of Gadara, a neighbour of the Jews, and well acquainted with their usages; εἰ δέ σε σαββατικός κατέχει πόθος, οὐ μέγα θαῦμα | ἔστι καὶ ἐν ψυχροῖς σάββασιν θερμὸς ἔρωσ. Anthologia, i. 25. lxxxiii.

ⁱ Macc. ii. 32—41. ix. 43. 44. Ant. Jud. xii. vi. 2. Bell. i. vii. 3. ii. xvi. 4. p. 484. lb. xxi. 8. iv. ii. 3. Ant. xiii. i. 3. Ib. xii. 4. xiv. iv. 2. xviii. ix. 2. 6. Vita, 32.
^k Ant. Jud. xii. i. 1. Contra Apionem, i. 22. 1193. Juvenal, vi. 158, 159. xiv. 96—106. Plutarch, Operum vi. 646, 647. De Superstitione. Dio Cass. xxxvii. 16.
^l Contra Apionem, ii. 39.

when to suspend and when to resume their ordinary employments^m. The catalogue of works regarded as *servile*, and forbidden to be performed on the sabbath, would amount to fifty or sixty; and the spirit of the prohibition in almost every instance would justify us in adding many more to the accountⁿ. Philo, De migratione Abrahami, enumerates several, such as, πυρρην αἰζειν^o, ἢ γεωπονεῖν, ἢ ἀχθοφορεῖν, ἢ ἐγκαλεῖν, ἢ δικάζειν, ἢ παρακαταθήκας ἀπαιτεῖν, ἢ δάνεια ἀναπράττειν, ἢ τὰ ἄλλα ποιεῖν, ὅσα κὰν τοῖς μὴ ἐορτώδεσι καιροῖς ἐφεῖται^p. In like manner Origen; οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς . . . οὔονται ἐπὶ τοῦ σχήματος, οὗ ἂν καταληφθῇ τις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου, μένειν μέχρις ἐσπέρας^q. And again, διόπερ εἰς ἀπεραντολογίαν οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων διδάσκαλοι ἐληλύθασι, φάσκοντες βάσταγμα μὲν εἶναι τὸ τοιόνδε ὑπόδημα, οὐ μὴν καὶ τὸ τοιόνδε· καὶ τὸ ἥλους ἔχον σανδάλιον, οὐ μὴν καὶ τὸ ἀνῆλωτον· καὶ τὸ οὕτως ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄμου φερόμενον, οὐ μὴν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν δύο ὤμων*.

The people, who could consider such forbearances as these to be points of conscience upon the sabbath, were not likely to be parties in that profanation of its sanctity, which every circumstance in our Lord's passion must otherwise have produced. Now if our Lord kept his Passover at the usual time, on the night after the fourteenth of Nisan, he was apprehended, tried, and crucified, on the fifteenth: and the fifteenth, being the first

* Bardesanes Syrus: ἀλλὰ καὶ κτίσαι οἶκον, οὐ καταλῦσαι, οὐκ ἐργάζασθαι, οὐ πωλῆσαι, οὐκ ἀγοράσαι, δι' ἡμερῶν ἐπτὰ πάντες ὅπου ἂν γάσασθαι, οὐ πωλῆσαι, οὐκ ἀγοράσαι, ὦσιν, ἀργοῦσιν ἐκ παντὸς ἔργου, καὶ ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ σαββάτου. Eusebius, Evangelica Præparatio, vi. οὔτε ὀδεύουσιν, οὔτε πυρὶ χρώνται, 10. 279. C.

^m Bell. iv. ix. 12. ⁿ Vide Mishna, ii. 29, 2, &c. Maimonides, De Noxiis imprudenter admissis, vi. 8. Annot. ^o Exod. xxxv. 3. ^p Operum i. 450. l. 34—37. Compare also ii. 168. l. 29. De Mose, iii. : 282. l. 45. De Septenario et Festis Diebus. ^q Operum i. 176. De Principiis, lib. iv. 17. Vide also Mishna, ii. 23, &c. and Hieronymus, Epistola ad Algasiam, iv. Pars i^a. 207. ad principium.

of the seven days τῶν ἁζύμων, as well as the twenty-first, which was the last, by express appointment was an extraordinary sabbath ; possessing, if possible, whensoever it might fall, greater holiness, and certainly not less, than the ordinary. Even the Mishna makes no other difference between the two kinds of sabbath than this; viz. that the people might dress provisions on the one, not on the other. Non est differentia inter diem festum et diem sabbathi nisi in edulibus tantum^r.

Those, therefore, who should contend that the extraordinary or special sabbaths possessed a less degree of estimation than the ordinary, would obviously beg the question ; and contend for that which they could never prove : and those who should maintain that, for the sake of effecting their purpose against our Saviour, the Sanhedrim determined to waive even the sanctity of the sabbath itself, would be guilty of the same precarious assumption ; gratuitously charging Scribes and Pharisees with a piece of profaneness of which even Scribes and Pharisees at this time were incapable.

Or though this should be conceded with respect to our Lord, why, at the same juncture and on the same occasion, it may yet be demanded, were two common malefactors, in whose case there was clearly nothing more than ordinary, put to death along with him ? What urgent necessity or special reason made *these*, as well as our Saviour, to be executed on a *sabbath* ? It appears to me that the crucifixion of the two thieves along with Christ, besides its subserviency to the fulfilment of prophecy, which was the final end proposed by Providence in permitting it ; proves that the feast was just at hand, but not yet come. They had not been executed before it, and they could not be executed during it : the case of St. Peter, in the twelfth chapter

of the Acts, is a clear proof that, while the great legal solemnities were going on, no criminal nor prisoner, for whatever offence, or howsoever obnoxious to the people themselves, was wont to be put to death. These malefactors were, in all probability, companions and accomplices of Barabbas, who also is called a *λησπύτης*, and whose execution had certainly been suspended, for some reason or other, long enough to give the people an opportunity of demanding, in the exercise of their usual privilege, that he should be set at liberty. Their crucifixion might always have been intended for this day; or the necessity of putting Jesus to death on this day furnished an occasion for carrying into effect their sentence also, at the same time and place with his.

The piety of some of our Lord's disciples would not allow them to prepare the spices for his embalment on the sabbath: would the same motive have allowed Nicodemus and Joseph to take down his body from the cross—to handle it—to lift it up—to carry it about—to embalm it as well as the time would permit—to deposit it in the sepulchre—to roll away, and to roll to, the stone at the mouth of the cave—all which were *opera servilia*, and unquestionably forbidden on the sabbath? The Jews of the time had obtained a concession from the Roman government, extending the sanctity of the sabbath to the three hours of the Parascue before it^s, so far at least as not to be compelled to attend to any civil business from the beginning of that time to the first hour of the ensuing week*. It was a regard to the holiness of the sabbath,

* The continuance of the Parascue itself, among the same kind of observance of the Jews of his day, is attested by

^s Ant. Jud. xvi. vi. 2.

which made the Sanhedrim request of Pilate that the deaths of the crucified parties might be accelerated; a request which, it is obvious, must have coincided as nearly as possible with the *ninth* hour, or the beginning of the Parasceue itself: and that this was no unusual custom, on the *eve* of great solemnities, is attested by Philo, adversus Flaccum^t: ἤδη τινὰς οἶδα τῶν ἀνεσκολοπισμένων, μελλούσης ἐνίστασθαι τοιαύτης ἐκεχειρίας, καθαιρεθέντας, καὶ τοῖς συγγενέσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ταφῆς ἀζιωθῆναι, καὶ τυχεῖν τῶν νενομισμένων, ἀποδοθέντας. It is not likely then, that they would have suffered those persons to be executed on the sabbath, whose bodies they would not allow to continue hanging upon the cross on the sabbath. Nor do I think that the Divine Providence would permit our Saviour to be crucified on the sabbath, though it might ordain that he should expire and be buried critically before the sabbath; that so his body might *rest* in the grave during the sabbath.

Sixthly, the sabbath which followed the day of the crucifixion, and which there is no doubt was the ordinary seventh day of the week, is called a *great* day^u: The day of that sabbath was a great day: for which peculiar greatness, distinct from the sanctity of the ordinary sabbath, there is no mode of accounting satisfactorily, but one: an *extraordinary* and an *ordinary*

Chrysostom, Operum iii. 161. A. B. In illud, Si esurierit, &c. 3: οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ Ἰουδαίους, οὐδὲ ἐρυθρῆς, οἱ μετὰ τοσαύτης ἀκριβείας τὸ σάββατον φυλάττουσι, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσπέρας αὐτῆς πάσης ἐργασίας ἀφίστανται; κὰν ἴδωσι τὸν ἥλιον πρὸς δυσμὰς ἐπείγόμενον ἐν τῇ τῆς παρασκευῆς ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ συμβόλαια διακόπτουσι καὶ πράξεις διατέμνουσι.

κὰν πριάμενός τις παρ' αὐτῶν πρὸ τῆς ἐσπέρας, ἐν ἐσπέρᾳ τὴν τιμὴν ἔλθῃ κομίζων, οὐκ ἀνέχονται λαβεῖν. κ', τ. λ. The same thing appears by implication in the Gospel of Nicodemus, cap. xv. (Auctarium Codicis Apocryphi, page 91.) where Joseph of Arimathea alludes to his imprisonment on the Parasceue, περὶ ὧραν δεκάτην.

^t Operum ii. 529. l. 17—20.

^u John xix. 31.

sabbath, the fifteenth of Nisan and the seventh day of the week, coincided together ; and being each of them a sabbath, produced by this coincidence a *double* sabbath, a sabbath of double sanctity, solemnized by peculiar offerings ^v, both those of the ordinary sabbath, in themselves twice as costly as the offerings on any other day of the week ^w, and those appointed for the first of the days of unleavened bread ; on the morrow after which too, the first-fruits of barley-harvest were to be consecrated in the wave-sheaf, and the computation of the fifty days until the next feast, the feast of Pentecost, was also to begin. This was enough to render that sabbath-day an *high* day. Any other explanation of this highness, especially that which supposes that the ordinary sabbath, whensoever it fell out, during a festal week was necessarily an *high* day ; unless that day was either the fifteenth or the twenty-first of Nisan in the seven days of the Azyrna, or the fifteenth or the twenty-second of Tisri in the octave of the Scenopegia ; would be precarious, and destitute of support from the requisite matter of fact.

But seventhly, the strongest argument that, if our Saviour celebrated any Passover upon this occasion, he celebrated it out of course, is deducible from the necessity of fulfilling, in two most important respects, the legal equity ; which could not otherwise be fulfilled. And this argument, though in my opinion it is sufficient of itself to decide the present controversy, commentators, both those who maintain and those who impugn the supposition at issue, have by a strange fatality attended to the least of any.

The entire system of types, and with the system of types the whole doctrine of the correspondency between the Jewish and the Christian dispensations

^v Numbers xxviii. 19—23.

^w Ibid. 3—10. Ant. Jud. iii. x. 1.

respectively, must fall to the ground, if the sacrifice of the Jewish Passover is not acknowledged to have been designed for a type and an emblem of the sacrifice of the death of Christ. There could be no such thing as a type in the ancient dispensation, if this in particular was none; there could be no rite, ceremony, or institution, in the Mosaic or Levitical economy, which bore any the least relation to Christ as the end of the Law, if this in particular bore none. No Evangelist—no Apostle—no orthodox Christian divine, either in ancient or in modern times—ever yet doubted of the truth of this relation; and St. Paul individually has asserted it in plain terms^x: Καὶ γὰρ ΤΟ ΠΑΣΧΑ ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτύθη ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ *.

Now if the sacrifice of the Jewish Passover was thus typical of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, then the circumstances of *time* and *place* become of paramount importance to the sacrifice of the death of Christ, because they were of paramount importance to the sacrifice of the Jewish Passover. This sacrifice was limited from the first, in point of *time*, to *one* day in the whole year, the *fourteenth* of Abib or Nisan; and in point of *place*, to that particular quarter, out of all possible situations, which God should select to fix his name there^y: which quarter, before the building of the temple, might be variable, and according to Maimonides^z, was either Gilgal, or Shiloh, or Nob, or Gibeah, or Jerusalem; in all which places the tabernacle was successively erected: but after the building of the temple became permanently fixed to Jerusalem^a.

* Τηρεῖν ἄζυμα, καὶ ποιεῖν τὸ ἐκώλυσεν ἐσθίειν ἄζυμα: Julianus, πᾶσχα οὐ δυνάμεθα φασίν· ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γὰρ ἅπαξ ἐτύθη Χριστός· εἶτα apud Cyrillum, 354. A. lib. x.

^x 1 Cor. v. 7. ^y Deut. xii. 5—14. xvi. 2. 5, 6. Josh. ix. 27. ^z De Edificio Templi, i. 2. ^a Cf. Josh. v. 10. xviii. 1. 1 Sam. i. 3. vii. 2. xxi. 1. xxii. 19. 2 Sam. vi. 3. 12. 1 Kings iii. 4. xi. 32. 1 Chron. xvi. 39. xxi. 29.

This being the case, a sacrifice, though performed at Jerusalem, and with all the ceremonies of the Jewish Passover (save and except the *second* Passover, which yet was restricted to the same day in the second month ^b) on any day but the fourteenth of Nisan, would not have been the Jewish Passover: and a sacrifice, though performed on the fourteenth of Nisan, and with all the ceremonies of the Jewish Passover, in any place but Jerusalem, would not have been the Jewish Passover. So indispensable to the constitution and integrity of the *type*, in this instance, were *time* and *place* in conjunction; and so little was either capable of answering its purpose without the other. Who, then, shall say that they were not equally indispensable to the *antitype*? Had Christ suffered, though he had suffered as a victim, on any day but the fourteenth of Nisan, could he have suffered as the Jewish Passover? Had Christ suffered, though he had suffered as a victim, any where but at Jerusalem, could he have suffered as the Jewish Passover? Had Christ suffered, though he had suffered as a victim, on any day but the fourteenth of Nisan, and at any place but Jerusalem, in conjunction, could he have suffered as the Jewish Passover*?

The circumstances of the Passion, so far as they are related, are all such as to coincide with this view of its secret character, or typical designation. Not to mention that most significant particular, expressly specified

* Justin Martyr, Dialogus, pars i. 218. 15: οὐδαμοῦ θύεσθαι τὸ πρόβατον τοῦ πάσχα ὁ Θεὸς συγχωρεῖ, εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ τόπῳ ᾧ ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. Ibid. 228. 16: καὶ κείνος ἀπεκρίνατο, Οὐ· γνωρίζομεν

γὰρ ἔτι, ὡς ἔφη, οὔτε πρόβατον τοῦ πάσχα ἀλλαχόσε θύειν δυνατόν, οὔτε τοὺς τῇ νηστείᾳ κελευσθέντας προσφέρεισθαι χιμάρους, οὔτε τὰς ἄλλας ἀπλῶς ἀπάσας προσφοράς.

^b Numb. ix. 6—13.

by St. John to shew the fulfilment of a well-known condition to the integrity of the Paschal victim^c, A bone of him shall not be broken—the place where our Lord suffered was unquestionably Jerusalem; that is, one of the two essential requisites to the sacrifice of the Passover, propriety of place, was visibly true of his death: and if he suffered on the fourteenth of Nisan, as St. John clearly implies, the other, propriety of time, was so too. But the analogy goes further than this. At the ninth hour of the day when he suffered our Lord expired; and in his expiration, that is in the separation of his soul from his body, in the rendering up his life to God, not in his previous attachment to, or suspension from the cross, must the article of his sacrifice properly be made to consist. At the ninth hour, on the proper day, Josephus informed us^d the sacrifices of the Jewish Passover began to be offered, continuing to be offered until the eleventh: ἐνστάσης ἑορτῆς, πᾶσχα καλεῖται, καθ' ἣν θύουσι μὲν ἀπὸ ἐννάτης ὥρας, μέχρι ἐνδεκάτης.

The ninth hour, then, according to the usage of the Jews, which is necessarily the best interpreter of the written precepts of their Law, was understood to be the time prescribed for the purpose, in the terms, Between the evenings; and very apposite to this conclusion is the following passage from the Paschal Homilies ascribed to St. Chrysostom^e: καὶ νόμου κελεύοντος πρὸς ἑσπέραν, καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἑσπερινῶν, τὸ πρόβατον σφάττεσθαι, καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ ὥραν τῆς σφαγῆς ἐπιτηρεῖ ὁ Σωτήρ· ἡμέραν μὲν τὴν παρασκευὴν . . . ὥραν δὲ, ἐννάτην· καὶ περὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ἐννάτην ἐπὶ σταυροῦ ἀποπνεῖ. πρὸς ἑσπέραν μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐβδόμης ὥρας εἶναι φασι, μετὰ τὴν ἕκτην· τὸ δὲ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἑσπερινῶν, εἰ ἀπὸ ἐβδόμης ἄρξῃ,

^c John xix. 36. Exod. xii. 46. Numb. ix. 12. Ps. xxxiv. 20. vi. ix. 3.

^e Operum viii. *Spuria*, 281. E. in Pascha vii. 4.

^d Bell.

τὸ κέντρον τῆς ἐννάτης τετελεσμένον ἐστίν· ἐν ᾗ καὶ οἱ σοφοὶ τῶν Ἑβραίων ἱστοροῦσι τὸ πρόβατον θύεσθαι^f.

It is observable too, that the same sacrifice of our Saviour answered almost as exactly to the daily sacrifice of the fourteenth of Nisan. The times of morning and of evening sacrifice in general, including the times of offering incense, of trimming the lamps, and of resorting to the temple for the purpose of prayer, are attested by Philo and by Josephus, as follows: *πρωτὶ γὰρ τὰ ἡμίση τῶν λεχθέντων, καὶ τὰ ἕτερα ἐσπέρας δειλινῆς ἐκέλευσεν ὄντως ἱεουργεῖν ὁ νόμος*^g—*Καθ' ἐκάστην μὲν οὖν ἡμέραν δύο ἀμνοὺς ἀνάγειν διείρηται· τὸν μὲν ἅμα τῇ ἑω, τὸν δὲ δείλης ἐσπέρας . . . δις δὲ καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ἐπιθυμιᾶται . . . εἴσω τοῦ καταπετάσματος, ἀνίσχοντος ἡλίου καὶ δυομένου, πρό τε τῆς ἑωθινῆς θυσίας καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐσπερινήν*^h—*Ἐκ δὲ τοῦ δημοσίου ἀναλώματος νόμος ἐστὶν ἄρνα καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν σφάττεσθαι τῶν αὐτοετῶν, ἀρχομένης τε ἡμέρας καὶ ληγούσης*ⁱ—*Ἀλλὰ δις τῆς ἡμέρας, πρωτὶ τε καὶ περὶ ἐννάτην ὥραν, ἱεουργοῦντων ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ*^k—*Δις δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας, πρὶν τε ἀνασχεῖν τὸν ἥλιον καὶ πρὸς δυσμαῖς, θυμιᾶν ἐχρῆν, ἔλαιόν τε ἀγνίσαντας φυλάσσειν εἰς τοὺς λύχνους*^l.

For the same things we may consult Maimonides *De Sacrificiis Jugibus*, cap. i. *passim*. According to his authority, it was considered evening as soon as the shadows began visibly to lengthen; that is, about half past twelve at noon: and the evening sacrifice, beginning at half past two, was generally over at half past three. The morning sacrifice also, though commonly begun before the sun was risen, might yet not be completed before the fourth hour of the day^m. Our Sa-

^f Vide also Maimonides, *De Sacrificiis Jugibus*, i. 3. Annott.

Operum i. 497. l. 29—31. *Quis Rerum Divinarum Hæres*.

^g Philo

^h *Ibid.* ii.

239. l. 5—19. *De Animalibus Sacrificio Idoneis*.

ⁱ *Ant. Jud.* iii. x. i.

^k xiv. iv. 3.

^l iii. viii. 3.

Vide also iv. viii. 13. *Exod.* xxix. 38, 39. xxx.

7, 8. *Lev.* xxiv. 2—4. *Numb.* xxviii. 3—8. Three of the branches of the candlestick were kept burning all day—and the remaining four also during the night. *Ant. Jud.* iii. viii. 3.

^m Vide *Mishna*, i. 13. 4.

viour, therefore, who was attached to the cross at the third hour, might answer even to that.

But the same authority informs us that, on the Pass-over day, the usual evening service was antedated, so as to be over before the ninth hour when the Paschal service was to begin. *Si vespera Paschalis*, says the Mishnaⁿ, *incideret in sabbathum* (which would be the case when the fourteenth of Nisan coincided with the Friday) *mactabatur* (sacrificium juge) *sexta et media*; *et offerebatur septima et media*; *et deinde Pascha*. At this particular time, then, the evening sacrifice was completed an hour sooner than usual, beginning soon after the sixth hour, and being over before the ninth; wherein also we may perceive a remarkable coincidence. The miraculous darkness which commenced about the sixth hour, and continued until the ninth, on the day of the crucifixion, would continue during the whole of the daily evening service in the temple; and for ought we know, it might have a special relation to it: it might be intended to shew that, while the great sacrifice was accomplished or accomplishing on the cross, the temple and the temple service were obscured for a time, and ready to be superseded for ever.

Again, as the Paschal sacrifice was a lively type of the death of Christ, so was the offering of the wave-sheaf of his resurrection; and in allusion to the former as St. Paul styles him our Passover, so in allusion to the latter he calls him the first-fruits of them that slept^o. To the fulfilment of the legal equity, then, it was just as necessary that the time of the resurrection should coincide with the time of the presentation of the first-fruits, as that the time of the Passion should do so with the time of the Passover. That presentation was

ⁿ ii. 150. 5. Cf. Maimonides, *De Sacrificiis Jugibus*, i. 5.

^o 1 Cor. xv. 20.

fixed to the hour of *πρωὶ* on the morning of the second day of the Azyma, that is, of the sixteenth of Nisan; which if Christ suffered on the fourteenth of Nisan was actually the time of his rising again. For if he suffered the day before the sabbath, and rose again the day after it—if the Friday when he suffered was the fourteenth, the Sunday when he rose again was the sixteenth: and as to the hour when he rose, according to St. Mark it was the prescribed hour, the hour of *πρωὶ* itself: *ἀναστὰς δὲ*, says he, *πρωὶ* ^p *. So exactly, on this one supposition that our Lord suffered on the Jewish Passover day, does every circumstance in the legal symbol, both as concerns his death and as concerns his resurrection, harmonize with the symbolized verity; and so ill, *per contra*, on any other. For if Christ kept the Jewish Passover on the fourteenth—he must have suffered on the fifteenth; he must have lain in

* The ancient commentators it is true, say that the actual time of the resurrection is nowhere specified in the Gospels; and therefore they connected *πρωὶ* in this passage, not with *ἀναστὰς*, but with *ἐφάνη*. Theophylact, i. 263. C. *in loc.*: 'Αναστὰς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐνταῦθα στίξον' εἶτα εἰπὲ, Πρωὶ πρώτῃ σαββάτου ἐφάνη Μαρία τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ· οὐ γὰρ ἀνέστη πρωὶ τίς γὰρ οἶδε πότε ἀνέστη; See also Eusebius, *Quæstiones ad Marinum*, i. (SS. Dep. Vat. Coll. i. 63. A): τὸ γὰρ, 'Αναστὰς δὲ πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ σαββάτου, κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον, μετὰ διαστολῆς ἀναγνωσόμεθα· καὶ μετὰ τὸ 'Αναστὰς δὲ, ὑποστίχομεν. Vide Suidas in *πρωὶ*, who has the same gloss. This expedient seemed necessary to reconcile St. Mark's *πρωὶ* with St. Matthew's *ὄψε σαβ-*

βάτων. The same view of reconciling St. Mark's account of the appearances of our Lord after the resurrection with that of the other Evangelists, probably gave occasion to the omission in many copies of his Gospel of the concluding portion of it, from xvi. 9. to the end. See the same *Quæstio*, 61. D. 62. B. and Hieronymus, *Operum* iv. pars i. 172. *ad medium*, Hedibixæ.

There is another instance of the same arbitrary kind of punctuation, to save an imaginary difficulty, Luke xxiii. 43. Theophylact, i. 487 B: ἄλλοι δὲ ἐκβιάζονται τὸ ῥῆμα, στίζοντες εἰς τὸ σήμερον, ὥς ἢ τὸ λεγόμενον τοιοῦτον· Ἄμην λέγω σοι σήμερον· εἶτα τὸ, Μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῇ παραδείσῳ, ἐπιφέροντες.

the grave all the sixteenth; and he could not have risen again until the seventeenth: in which case not one of the above circumstances could have any thing to do with his Passion.

The judgment of the primitive church upon these points is decidedly expressed in the following passages.

Τὸ γὰρ ὀπτόμενον πρόβατον, σχηματίζομενον ὁμοίως τῷ σχήματι τοῦ σταυροῦ ὀπτᾶται· εἰς γὰρ ὄρθιος ὀβελίσκος διαπερονᾶται ἀπὸ τῶν κατωτάτω μερῶν μέχρι τῆς κεφαλῆς, καὶ εἰς πάλιν κατὰ τὸ μετάφρενον, ᾧ προσαρτῶνται καὶ αἱ χεῖρες τοῦ προβάτου—Καὶ ὅτι ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ πάσχα συνελάβετε αὐτὸν, καὶ ὁμοίως ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐσταυρώσατε, γέγραπται ^q—*Et non est numerum dicere in quibus a Moyse ostenditur Filius Dei: cujus et diem passionis non ignoravit; sed figuratim prænuntiavit eum, Pascha nominans: et in eadem ipsa, quæ ante tantum temporis a Moyse prædicata est, passus est Dominus, adimplens Pascha* ^r—*Quæ passio . . perfecta est . . temporibus paschæ . . die prima azymorum, quo agnum ut occiderent ad vesperam a Moyse fuerat præceptum. itaque omnis synagoga filiorum Israel eum interfecit, dicentes ad Pilatum—et quæ sequuntur* ^s—Τοῖς μὲν οὖν παρεληλυθόσιν ἔτεσι τὸ θυόμενον πρὸς Ἰουδαίων ἡσθιεν ἐορτάζων ὁ Κύριος πάσχα· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐκήρυξεν, αὐτὸς ὦν τὸ πάσχα . . . αὐτίκα ἐδίδαξε μὲν τοὺς μαθητὰς τοῦ τύπου τὸ μυστήριον τῇ ιγ'. ἐν ἣ καὶ πυνθάνονται αὐτοῦ· Ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμέν σοι τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν; ταύτη οὖν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ὁ ἁγιασμός τῶν ἁζύμων, καὶ ἡ προετοιμασία τῆς ἐορτῆς, ἐγίνετο . . . πέπονθε δὲ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, αὐτὸς ὦν τὸ πάσχα, καλλιερευθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων. And again; ταύτη τῶν ἡμερῶν τῇ ἀκριβείᾳ καὶ αἱ γραφαὶ πᾶσαι συμφωνοῦσι, καὶ τὰ εὐαγγέλια συνῶδά. ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις· τῇ γοῦν τρίτῃ ἀνέστη ἡμέρᾳ, ἥτις ἦν πρώτη (ita

^q Justin Martyr, Dialogus, 218. l. 26—219. l. 1: 374. l. 19—22. ^r Irenæus, Operum 309. l. 20. Lib. iv. cap. 23. ^s Tertullian, Operum ii. 300. Adversus Judæos, 8.

legendum) τῶν ἐβδομάδων τοῦ θερισμοῦ, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τὸ δράγμα ἐνομοθετεῖτο προσενεγκεῖν τὸν ἱερέα ^t—Ἡ ιδ'. τὸ ἀληθινὸν τοῦ Κυρίου πάσχα, ἡ θυσία ἡ μεγάλη . . . *usque ad* καὶ ὁ ταφεὶς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τοῦ πάσχα, ἐπιτεθέντος τῷ μνήματι τοῦ λίθου ^u—Ωι καιρῷ ἔπασχεν ὁ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἔφαγε τὸ κατὰ νόμον πάσχα· οὗτος γὰρ ἦν τὸ πάσχα, τὸ προκεκηρυγμένον, καὶ τὸ τελειούμενον τῇ ὥρισμένῃ ἡμέρᾳ. And again; ὁ πάλαι προειπὼν ὅτι Οὐκέτι φάγομαι τὸ πάσχα, εἰκότως τὸ μὲν δεῖπνον ἐδείπνησεν πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα· τὸ δὲ πάσχα οὐκ ἔφαγεν, ἀλλ' ἔπαθεν. οὐδὲ γὰρ καιρὸς ἦν τῆς βρώσεως αὐτοῦ ^v.

The testimony of St. John, as specified above, taken in its simple and obvious historical sense, as we there observed, ought to be considered decisive; since in a case of this kind the authority of the last Evangelist, writing with an equal knowledge of the truth and of what his predecessors had said, should upon every principle be admitted not as contradictory to, but as merely explanatory of their's. It must be acknowledged too that, in his detail of the same supper, no such expression any where occurs as would suggest the inference that our Lord was celebrating a *Passover*. This attention to precision resembles the precaution of a writer, who knew that the language of those before him on the same subject had not been sufficiently explicit; the best

^t Clemens Alexandrinus, ii. 1017. Apud Fragmenta. ^u Apollinarius, Hierapolitanus Episcopus, Apud Chronicon Paschale, 14 l. 6—14. ^v Hippolytus Portuensis, ibid. 13. l. 5—13. Vide also, Ignatius Ad Trallianos, ix. Justin Martyr, Apologia Prima 98. l. 27. Polycrates, Rel. Sacrae i. 371. Tertullianus, Adv. Marc. iv. 40. Operum i. 357: v. 7. Ibid. 399: Adv. Jud. 10. ii. 320. Origen, iii. 401—403. In Joh. tom. xxviii. 20, 21. Cyprian, Operum 110. and Epp. 156. Petrus Alexandrinus, Rel. Sacrae, iii. 343. Victorinus, ibid. 236. 237. Lactantius, De Ver. Sap. iv. 26. 395. 396. Eusebius, ap. SS. Dep. i. 169 B.—170. C. Epiphanius, i. 421. A. B. Photii Bibliotheca, Tit. 115. 116. Theophylact, i. 741. D. E. in Joh. xviii. Epiphanius i. 448. Alogi. xxvi. xxvii. has a singular statement, viz. that our Lord celebrated his Passover, and was apprehended, on the evening of the third day of the week, though he is still supposed to have suffered on the sixth. The anticipation of the Passover he endeavours to account for, by shewing that the Jews might be two days wrong in their reckoning of the fourteenth of the moon. The other difficulty he does not explain, viz. what account is to be given of the Thursday morning and night between the apprehension and the death.

apology for which I apprehend to be this; viz. that the connection between the Jewish Passover and the Christian sacrifice, and consequently the necessity that Christ should suffer *then* and *there, when* and *where* the Passover was to be celebrated, appeared to their minds so close and so indispensable that, in whatever terms they might have spoken of the previous supper, no one who, like them, was habitually impressed with the conviction of this truth would mistake it for the regular Passover, and not consider it merely an anticipation of it, produced and justified by the special reasons of the case.

Besides which, it ought always to be remembered that the *last* Jewish Passover was the *first* Christian supper; it was not more a Passover than an Eucharist: and to convert the Legal into the Evangelical ceremony was doubtless one great cause of that anxious desire to celebrate the Passover for that time with his disciples, before he suffered, which our Lord expressed^w. Now the Christian supper, as an institution expressly and formally commemorative of the death of Christ, if it was established at this time was proleptically established; for the death of Christ was not yet transacted. And the circumstance that it was so instituted is among the other arguments both that the Passover in general, out of which ceremony it arose, was typical of the death of Christ in general, and that this Passover in particular, at which it was proleptically instituted, was proleptically celebrated also.

I shall conclude, therefore, by observing that St. Matthew's, τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἁζύμων^x—St. Mark's, τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἁζύμων^y—St. Luke's, ἡλθε δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἁζύμων, ἐν ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα^z; all which are intended to designate the day when the Apostles came

w Luke xxii. 15.

x Matt. xxvi. 17.

y Mark xiv. 12.

z Luke xxii. 7.

to our Lord to inquire about preparing the Passover; understood on the principle laid down by Maimonides^a, that the proper beginning of any feast-day was reckoned from the *night* which preceded it, may all be intended to designate the night of the thirteenth of Nisan, the beginning of the Jewish fourteenth*. The whole of this *νυχθήμερον*, from sunset on Thursday to sunset on Friday, was considered and might be called the *first* day of unleavened bread. Josephus himself makes the Paschal octave an octave of ἄζυμα, reckoning the fourteenth of Nisan as the first of the number. And it might be truly so reckoned; for the putting away of all leaven, and of every thing leavened, began with the evening of the thirteenth^b †.

We have but to suppose that the disciples came with their inquiry at sunset on Thursday, and were sent at that time accordingly; and the assertion would be strictly correct. The circumstance that, on entering the city, they were to meet a man returning home with a pitcher of water, is a presumptive proof that they entered it in the evening, at one of the times when water was wont to be fetched. The room too, which they were to find ready ἐστρωμένον, must have been set out for that evening's repast; which would consequently be for supper.

* Apollinarius of Laodicea (SS. Dep. Vaticana Coll. i. 188. D): ἀρχεται γὰρ ὁ σαββατισμὸς Ἰουδαίοις, καὶ πᾶσα ἑορτὴ νόμιμος, ἀπὸ ἐσπέρας.

Augustin, ii. 80. D. Epp. xxxvi: §. 50. Sed Matthæus Evangelista quintam sabbati dicit fuisse primam diem azymorum, quia ejus vespera sequente futura erat cœna paschalis, qua cœna incipiebat azymum et ovis

immolatio manducari.

† Suidas, ζύμη· ὅτι λόγος ἔχει ὡς ἀπὸ 5'. ὥρας τῆς ιδ'. τοῦ μηνὸς ἡμέρας, σάβιγγος φωνούσης, πᾶς ἄρτος ζυμωτὸς, εἴ τις τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ὑπελείπετο, πυρὶ καίόμενος ἠφανίζετο. So likewise Theodore Metochita, Historia Romana, 34. But this gloss is founded on the literal construction of St. John's statement, ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα ὥρα δὲ ὥσεί ἐκτη.

^a De Sacris Solemnibus, ii. 5.

^b Mishna ii. 134. 1.

I prefer this mode of construing these phrases because it applies to each of the three cases alike; and because, by this means, if the Passover was actually got ready on the Jewish fourteenth of Nisan, though not at the legitimate time, which was the end rather than the beginning of that day, still it would be as nearly regular, and as close to the proper time, as the nature of the case would permit. The ordinary supper time, as we saw from Josephus, was probably as late as the first or second hour of the night; and with a view to such a repast as the Passover we may take it for granted it would be: for the Passover was always to be killed on the *fourteenth* and eaten on the *fifteenth*: in which case the actual business of eating it could not begin until after sunset on that day at least.

Yet St. Luke's expressions in particular may be generally understood to mean that the first day τῶν ἁζύμων was come, when the night before it was arrived; and ἐν ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα may be referred to that day when it should arrive. St. Matthew's and St. Mark's might be defended in like manner on the principle stated elsewhere^c, that πρώτη is equivalent to προτέρα. The Greek interpreters understood it in that sense; and therefore considered the exchange of terms no difficulty^d. Theophylact's comment upon St. Matthew, *in loco*, is this^e: πρώτην τῶν ἁζύμων τὴν πρὸ τῶν ἁζύμων φησὶν ἡμέραν· οἶον, τί λέγω; τῇ παρασκευῇ, ἐσπέρας, ἔμελλον ἐκείνοι φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα· καὶ αὕτη ἐκαλεῖτο τῶν ἁζύμων. ὁ γοῦν Κύριος πέμπει τοὺς μαθητὰς τῇ πέμπτῃ, ἣν ὀνομάζει ὁ Εὐαγγελιστὴς πρώτην τῶν ἁζύμων, ὡς πρὸ τῆς παρασκευῆς οὖσαν, καθ' ἣν παρασκευὴν, τῇ ἐσπέρα, ἦσθιον τὰ ἄζυμα.

^c Dissertation xiv. vol. i. 546—549. ^d Chrysostom, Operum vii. 773. B. in Matt. Homilia 81. 1. ^e Operum i. 145. B. In Matthæum, xxvi: 248. A. In Marcum, xiv: 465. E. In Lucam, xxii.

DISSERTATION XLII.

On the proceedings of the night of Thursday, and the morning of Friday, in Passion-week.

THE best distribution which we can make of the transactions of both these periods—the former of which answers to the thirteenth of the Jewish Nisan and the fourth of the Julian April, and the latter to the fourteenth of the one and the fifth of the other—is first, from the beginning of the celebration of the last supper to the time of the apprehension of Jesus; secondly, from the time of the apprehension of Jesus to the time of his being brought before Pilate; thirdly, from the time of his being brought before Pilate to the time of his being led away to be crucified; fourthly, from the time of his being led away to be crucified to the time of his being taken down from the cross, and buried.

With regard to each of these divisions, as well as to the residue of the Gospel accounts, though the difficulties, which present themselves in the way of an Harmony, will be found to be neither few nor trifling, yet the reduction of St. Matthew to an entire agreement with St. Mark will be seen to be a much easier task, than the reduction of St. Luke or of St. John to a similar agreement with either of them, or with each other.

These difficulties, however, will be sensibly mitigated, if not altogether removed, by the help of the principle so often enforced already; which is to consider the later Gospels as designedly supplementary to the earlier; a relation, of which the whole of this portion of their narratives furnishes the clearest proofs,

and of which no part of the Gospel Harmony makes the application either more justly or with more success. The best mode of reconciling the respective accounts, in a given instance, is consequently to regard them in this mutual relation, and to insert the particulars, supplied by a later, where there is reason to suspect the existence of hiatuses or omissions in an earlier.

The first division is comprised by Matt. xxvi. 20–56. Mark xiv. 17–52. Luke xxii. 14–53. John xiii–xviii. 11. inclusively. The facts which it contains are partly the circumstances of the supper previously to the departure to the garden; and partly the circumstances posterior to that but prior to the apprehension of Jesus. The scene of the former was altogether the upper chamber where the supper was celebrated; the scene of the latter was partly the way from thence to mount Olivet, and partly the garden upon the mount. The one, then, may be referred to *one* period of time, viz. between the sitting down to supper and the departure to the mount; the other may be referred to *another*, between the time of the departure to the mount and the time of the seizure of Jesus.

The commencement of the Paschal supper, we may reasonably suppose, would be the usual time of that solemnity; which, according to the appointment of the Law, was the evening *after* the Passover had been killed; and, consequently, as we before observed, after not before the beginning of the Jewish fifteenth of Nisan. The time answerable to this in the present instance would be after not before the beginning of the Jewish fourteenth; a time which St. Luke expresses in general by *ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα*, and St. Matthew as well as St. Mark more explicitly by *ὀψίας γενομένης*.

And now, the celebration of the supper in the usual

manner of the Passover having thus been begun; for the better explanation of subsequent particulars some account of the ceremonies, with which the Passover was wont to be commemorated, might perhaps appear to be requisite. But the use of any such account would be merely to define certain leading points of time in the economy of the supper from first to last; before or after which the corresponding divisions of the narrative might most conveniently be introduced. I consider it, therefore, sufficient for my present purpose to touch upon those *general* outlines only; referring such as desire a more minute and detailed explanation of the same things to the authors who have treated expressly of this subject. There is good reason indeed to doubt whether the Paschal ritual, as it is commonly described in such books, is perfectly authentic, and to be depended on. It is an obvious objection to its truth or probability, that it makes of a very simple ceremony one of the most formal and most complicated imaginable. On this question, however, it is by no means incumbent upon me to enter at present.

I. At this point of time, when our Saviour and his twelve disciples were now met together, and the solemnity was ready to begin, we may introduce Luke xxii. 15, 16, peculiar to that account; and consequently the first clear proof of an omission in St. Matthew's or St. Mark's.

II. Perhaps with no sensible interval after this, as the Paschal supper began and ended with the introduction of a cup of wine, the act, and the declaration accompanying the act, at Luke xxii. 17, 18, might also take place. This too is peculiar to his account; and therefore a proof of a second omission in St. Matthew and St. Mark. Nor can *this* cup, and what was connected with its introduction, reception, and distribution

among the disciples, be confounded on any principle with what is similarly related at verse 20, of *another* cup; as the place of each in a common account, and the absence of the article before the mention of the one, and its presence before the mention of the other, are sufficient to prove. This circumstance of distinction shews the introduction, reception, and distribution of that other cup to have been a very different thing from the introduction, reception, and distribution of the former. The well-known Christian cup arose out of the one, but not out of the other. St. Matthew and St. Mark also mention such a cup; which may agree with the second in St. Luke; but the first must still be peculiar to him: and if a similar declaration concerning the fruit of the vine accompanied both, St. Luke, who had specified this in the former instance, might naturally omit it in the latter.

III. Since it must be evident that the supper was actually now begun, there is no point of time where we can better introduce St. John's account of the washing the disciples' feet, than this; first, because the act took place *δείπνου γενομένου*—when the supper must have been begun, though not necessarily when it was over: secondly, because it took place in the *course* of the supper; our Lord arose from table to perform it; and having performed it he resumed his former position; a position, which the Greek terms employed, *ἀναπεσὼν πάλιν*, determine to be the position of a person at meat. The act therefore was critically interposed between the beginning and the end of the same solemnity; the supper had been going on before it, and continued to go on after it. Thirdly, the allusion in verses 10. and 11, demonstrates that Judas was still present, and one of those whose feet were washed. But after the time implied at verse 30, he was not still

present: and that time, as we shall see hereafter, was much prior to the conclusion of the supper.

The whole of this account, then, from John xiii. 1–17, impressive and significant as it is, is clearly an *episode*, relating to a matter of fact between the two extremes of the Paschal solemnity; and strictly independent of them both: which is probably the true reason why the former Evangelists omitted it. With the motive, the final end, or the circumstances of it, we have nothing to do at present. It might evidently come where we have placed it; and as our Lord began with Peter, he probably ended with Judas, and took the rest of the Apostles in their order between them.

IV. Upon the resumption of our Saviour's place at the table, the next thing, in the order of particulars, might be the introduction and consumption of the Paschal lamb; coincident with which, either during or immediately after it, we may place the institution of the breaking of the bread, the first part of the Christian sacrament. The lamb in the Paschal, and the bread in the Evangelical supper, were equally types of the same body of Christ; nor could a fitter time perhaps for the conversion of the Legal into the Christian symbol have been pitched upon, than the precise moment when, the Legal purpose designed by the former being now complete, the virtue of the Jewish was thenceforward to cease, and that of the Christian to begin.

Besides, it is evident that of the Paschal lamb Jesus himself partook; but of the Christian symbol, which was the bread, it does not appear that he did partake. To judge from the account of each of the Evangelists, He took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and distributed it among his disciples; but it is not said that he ate of it himself: nor in fact, consistently with the de-

sign and import of the bread, which represented his own body as broken *for them*, could he have eaten of it along *with them*. The same thing is true of the blessing, consecration, and distribution of the cup, significant of the blood, as the bread was of the body of Christ. He required *all* the disciples to drink of that cup; but it does not appear that he drank of it himself.

We may observe also, that in the mention of the bread there is not in St. Mark or in St. Luke* such an use of the Greek article as would imply that the reception, the blessing, and the distribution of that substance, at this time, were regular parts of the Paschal ceremony; as might be the case with the cup. Strictly rendered, their language is, Jesus having taken *bread*, ἄρτον—not, τὸν ἄρτον—which may even suggest the inference that the bread which he used was *leavened* bread. For unleavened bread was in the shape of *cakes*—but ἄρτος, in its proper sense, is not a *flat cake*, but a *round loaf* of bread. Hence, in the account of the temptation, there was a propriety in Satan's first address^a; Command that these stones become *not cakes*, *but* loaves of bread: and there is a similar propriety at Luke xi. 11, in our Lord's own words: Which of you, being a father, if his son ask him for a *loaf*, will give him a *stone*? as much as in what follows: If he ask him for an *egg*, will he give him a *scorpion*? for an egg in shape

* St. Matthew is an exception; for he reads, λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ΤΟΝ ἄρτον, xxvi. 26: but this may be explained without detriment to the argument derivable from the absence of the article in the other two instances. Jesus is said

to have taken *the* bread, because the bread so taken became from that moment the well-known symbol of the Christian supper; considered in which light it could not be spoken of without the article.

^a Matt. iv. 3. see also Luke iv. 3.

somewhat resembles a scorpion, as a loaf somewhat resembles a stone. The drift of all this is to imply that the institution of the bread was something out of the usual Paschal course; and such as might be posterior to, and must be distinct from the process of the consumption of the Paschal victim.

The institution of the Christian sacrament is altogether omitted by St. John; and, for an obvious reason, *he* could not be expected to record it. With regard to St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, they all agree in representing the institution of the bread as prior to that of the cup; and they all agree in placing the institution of the bread during, not after the supper; the two former expressly, in the words, ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν—the latter by implication; where, speaking of the appointment of the cup as μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνῆσαι, he virtually recognises the ordinance of the bread as ἐν τῷ δεῖπνεῖν. Beyond this there is some disagreement. St. Luke, confirmed by St. Paul in the well-known passage, 1 Cor. xi. 25, places the institution of the cup *after* the supper; and, consequently, at a different time from the institution of the bread, which was during it: St. Matthew and St. Mark record them both in conjunction, and therefore, apparently at least, place them both at the same time.

In order to explain this difference, we must look at the final end proposed by these two Evangelists more particularly, in their account of the proceedings within the upper chamber: which end was manifestly this: out of a great variety of circumstances or discourses, which then occurred, to notice nothing distinctly except what related directly to *two* points—the consummation of the treachery of Judas—and the sacramental ordinance. With regard to the first of these, they had given an account of the original formation, and of the

first overt act in the execution, of his design : nothing, then, remained but to relate the completion ; which the event proved was to ensue that same night, and after that very supper. Now that Judas had fixed upon this night, *before* the supper, does not appear ; that Satan entered into his heart, in consequence of something which happened at the supper, and urged him to perpetrate his scheme that night, does appear. The connection, therefore, between the circumstances of the last supper and the design, the prosecution, and the effect of the treachery of Judas, becomes decided ; and as each of the Evangelists had given an account of the two first of these things, it was but natural that they should also specify the last.

Without the previous and significant allusion to his approaching betrayal, and by such a means as the instrumental agency of this disciple, which made part of the history of the supper just before ; their account of our Lord's ultimate apprehension in the garden, by a band under the guidance of Judas, would have been an inexplicable effect. A stranger to the Christian history would not have been prepared, *then* and *there* at least, for any such effect : and this we may consider one of the strongest proofs that St. Luke must have seen St. Matthew and St. Mark, and purposely omitted what had been specified by them ; that he records, as well as either of them, the seizure of Jesus, and the presence of Judas at the head of the band, but says not a word of the previous discovery of his treachery.

Nor was the allusion in question, even in St. Matthew or in St. Mark, so altogether minute as to leave no room for the supply of a very important particular by St. John. From the comparison of *their* accounts *before* and *at* the time of our Lord's apprehension, respectively, it is evident that they have left to conjecture

an essential step in the progress of events ; the departure of Judas from the upper-chamber, where he was present at the commencement of the supper, before the setting out to the garden ; whither he could not possibly have accompanied the rest. This omission is exactly supplied by St. John ; who distinctly specifies both *when* he went out, and *why*.

With regard to the second point, or to the sacramental institution ; that was the institution of *one* integral ceremony, but with *two* significant parts. Hence if the Evangelists desired to record the whole as such, though each of the parts might have been separately and individually appointed, they would record them both in conjunction. The example of St. Luke proves the necessity of so doing. As giving an account of the same entire ceremony, he connects together the respective institution of each of its parts ; yet gives at the same time a clear intimation that the time of the one was, in reality, somewhat later than that of the other : that the bread was ordained *during* the supper, the use of the cup was prescribed *after* it.

It follows, then, that the history of the Christian sacrament, considered as *one* whole made up of *two* component parts, coinciding with the proper time of the institution of either, must so far have antedated or postponed the proper time of the institution of the other : and yet, as an account of one and the same ceremony, to the perfection of which the part antedated or postponed was as necessary and as essential as the other, it could not in either case be regarded strictly as an Anticipation, or a Trajection. This is the distinction which holds good in the several Evangelists, with reference to the present question ; and this is the principle on which we may satisfactorily explain it. St. Luke records the institution of the bread at its

proper time, and therefore, anticipates that of the cup: St. Matthew and St. Mark record the institution of the cup at its proper time, and, therefore, postpone that of the bread. In either case this is done respectively with the one purely for the sake of the other. If both could not be recorded in their own time and place at once, (which in the nature of things was impossible,) one must be recorded out of its place, though the other might not; and if both were to be recorded together, though the one might be regular where it stood, the other would be so far irregular. As to which of the two should be selected to give the law of narration to the other, this would be indifferent: historical precision might require it to be the account of the bread—the integrity of the whole ceremony might require it to be that of the cup. The Sacrament began to be instituted when the use of the former was prescribed; but it was not complete until the latter had been prescribed also. St. Luke's scrupulous exactness determined him to pitch upon the former; the design of St. Matthew and St. Mark, which was to place on record the institution of the ceremony as such, made them prefer the latter. Yet St. Luke shews clearly that the account of the consecration of the cup, which he subjoins to the mention of that of the bread, is subjoined entirely as a *parenthesis*; and St. Matthew or St. Mark by no means implies that the institution of the bread immediately preceded, though it is related just before the institution of the cup.

It will follow therefore, that the continuation of what was actually said or done along with the institution of the bread is found in St. Luke from xxii. 19. to 21, 22: xxii. 20. is entirely parenthetical. The method of reconciling the several accounts of the *terms* of the institution will be exhibited in the Harmony

itself; resolving every semblance of discrepancy into the mere omission of some things by one, which are supplied by another.

At this point of time, then, that is, directly after Luke xxii. 22, I think it right to introduce John xiii. 18, 19, 20. It is incredible how much these verses gain by this arrangement in clearness, propriety, and significancy; and the only objection to it is, that they appear to follow, as part of a continuous discourse, on xiii. 17. But so does xiv. 1. on xiii. 38: and yet much independent matter—one circumstance whereof was the institution of the cup at least—must, as we shall see by and by, have been interposed between them. The supplementary character of St. John's Gospel is, in fact, an answer to the whole objection.

V. St. John proceeds to subjoin—which is a confirmation of the proposed arrangement—that, after saying these things, viz. after verse 20, Jesus was *troubled*, or *distressed* in spirit; evidently by a lively sense of the perfidy and ingratitude of one of his own Apostles, such as the preceding reflections could not but obtrude upon him: and *testified*, that is, *bore witness to the futurity of his guilt*, saying, ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν, λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με. Here then, his account coincides critically, and in the use of the very same expressions, with Matt. xxvi. 21. and Mark xiv. 18. The perplexity produced among the disciples, by this sudden and open declaration, is next specified by all the Evangelists, and carries forward the thread of the narrative in a very natural order; though St. Luke, for the reasons so often assigned, without descending into particulars, is content barely to notice the fact. St. John does so descend; but only to supply an anecdote

omitted by St. Matthew and by St. Mark, yet intimately connected with what they do record.

They had each specified the fact of one disciple's after another inquiring of Jesus, Is it I? but neither of them the private conversation between St. John himself, Simon Peter, and our Lord, relating to the recognition of the traitor; perhaps for this very reason that it was *private*, or confined to these three in particular. Now the Roman custom, by which guests reclined at meat upon distinct couches, each containing three, or at the utmost four* persons apiece, which the Jews also had adopted; rendered it very possible for such a conversation and such a recognition, confined to these two disciples, apart from the observation of the rest, to have taken place. It is probable that our Lord, with St. John, reclined on the same couch, and at the upper end or at the centre of the table, *that* being the post of the master of an entertainment; while the rest of the company reclined upon three or four other couches, upon either hand of him, all down the table. Simon Peter's position in particular might be near the upper end, if it was not even on the same couch as St.

* Ergo duos post | Si libuit menses neglectum adhibere clientem, | *Tertia* ne vacuo cessaret culcita lecto, | Una simus, ait: Juvenal, v. 15. The Scholiast upon this passage of Juvenal observes, Tres autem lectuli erant in quibus discumbebant. Sæpe tribus lectis videas cœnare *quaternos*: Horace, Sermonum i. iv. 86.

Again, Tum in lecto quoque videres. | Stridere secreta divisos aure susurros: Horace, Sermonum ii. viii. 77. Propertius, iv. viii.

35: Unus erat tribus in secreta lectulus umbra: | Quæris concubitus? inter utramque fui.

Plutarch, viii. 448. Symposiaca, i. 3: the most honourable seat at table was Πέρσαις μὲν ὁ μεσαίτατος, ἐφ' οὗ κατακλίνεται ὁ βασιλεὺς· Ἕλλησι δὲ ὁ πρῶτος· Ῥωμαίοις δὲ ὁ τῆς μέσης κλίνης τελευταίος, ὃν ὑπατικὸν προσαγορεύουσι. Apollonius Tyan. iii. 8. 134. D: κατακείσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐν ξυσσιτίῳ μὲν, οὐ μὴν πρόκριτόν γε τὸν βασιλείᾳ· τοῦτο δὴ τὸ παρ' Ἕλλησι τε καὶ Ῥωμαίοις πολλοῦ ἀξίου.

John's—*above* our Saviour, as the latter might be *below* him : whence he might easily make to St. John that signal which led to the inquiry in question. The accuracy of the Evangelist's description is observable in one apparently slight circumstance, which nevertheless is graphically exact. The relative posture of those who reclined on a common couch was such, that the head of the lower was nearly on a par with the breast of the higher up of the two *. Hence the observation of the Evangelist, ἐπιπεσὼν δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ—which means his leaning back upon the breast of Jesus : as would necessarily be the case, if he wished, while in his preexisting situation, to ask him a question.

This private conversation, then, we may suppose would take place after the questions recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark, as far as they go in conjunction, had been put and been answered. It is evident, however, from the mention of the *dish*, which now ensues, and which we may presume denotes the dish of bitter herbs (or *πικρίδες*) prepared after a certain manner by themselves, and brought in when the eating of the lamb was over ; that the solemnity was far advanced ; and, consequently, that the night was proportionably advanced also : which accounts for the observation, John xiii. 30. Upon the reception of the sop, Satan, says the Evangelist, entered into Judas ; and I persuade myself that the words directly after ascribed to our Lord—ὁ ποιεῖς ποίησον τάχιον—were intended, and are to be understood, to be addressed to Satan, then in possession of Judas ; though they would appear to the rest of the company to be addressed to Judas.

In consequence of the same construction, as consi-

* Pliny, *Epistolarum* iv. xxii. 4 : Veiento proximus, atque etiam in sinu recumbebat,

dering himself addressed, and perhaps as applying, in his own conscience, what had been said, to the fact of his secret intentions, Judas himself might then put the question, recorded solely by St. Matthew, verse 25, μήτι ἐγὼ εἶμι, 'Paββί; followed by the answer, σὺ εἶπας. It is possible also that he acted in putting it under the immediate impulse of the Devil; since, without some such impulse, we can scarcely suppose he would have ventured to ask a question, which implied either a doubt of our Saviour's knowledge of his purpose, or a bold defiance of it; a reckless indifference to the exposure of his perfidy—or the like. But the truth may be, that when he sat down to supper he had not made up his mind to betray our Lord that night; and not being aware of any such intention, as already conceived, when he received the sop, he might put the question accordingly. The agency of Satan, then, must be sought for not so much in his being instigated to put that question, as in his being determined to consummate his purpose that night.

The departure of Judas followed with no delay on the reception of the sop; and if his departure, for the reason assigned, created no surprise among the rest of the disciples, two conclusions will be presumptively established by it; viz. that this supper was not a Paschal supper, and, whatsoever it was, that the supper was almost over. On the Paschal night no member of the Paschal *sodalitium* would have thought of leaving the Paschal chamber before midnight at least; or if he did quit it, his departure would be something out of course.

VI. After this, we may place without hesitation, and in a consecutive order, John xiii. 30—the end; a part of his Gospel which stands entirely by itself, and which it would be in vain to endeavour to harmonize

with any portion of the rest. It is memorable, however, as containing an express prediction of the denials of Peter; a prediction which, as arising naturally out of the course and turn of the conversation, it would be improper to consider an Anticipation: and if it is not an Anticipation, but an actual part of the narrative where it stands, it is a distinct and independent instance of any such prophecy: yet as no such prophecy has hitherto preceded, though similar predictions may be hereafter repeated, it will be the first instance of the kind.

VII. After John xiii. 38, there is clearly room for the supposition of a pause in the continuity of his account; during which, if the Paschal ceremony was not yet complete, it would still be going on; and in the course of which that dispute among the disciples, respecting their comparative greatness, and the consequent rebuke passed upon it by our Lord, which begin to be recorded Luke xxii. 24, may appositely be introduced. The language of the reproof is such as can leave no doubt that it was directed against some present and some passing, and not some former instance of the dispute in question; and there are two allusions in it, or subjoined shortly upon it, which tend to prove that both these incidents were posterior first to the act of washing the disciples' feet, and secondly to the departure of Judas from the supper chamber.

The former is contained in the words of verse 27: ἐγὼ δὲ εἶμι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν ὡς ὁ διακονῶν—the truth and propriety of which declaration, coupled with the recollection of the late significant transaction, which was eminently the act of one who *served* or *ministered**,

* Behold, let thine handmaid be a servant, to wash the feet of the servants of my Lord:

I Sam. xxv. 41.—Quæ tibi jucundo famularer serva labore, | Candida permulcens liquidis ve-

would be self-evident: but not on any other principle: for what menial or servile act, distinct from the part ordinarily discharged at the Paschal ceremony by the principal personage of the company, is our Saviour seen or known to have performed besides this? The latter is found in the words of verse 31: Σίμων, Σίμων, ἰδοὺ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς, τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον*. The force of the Greek middle is strikingly exemplified in the use of this verb ἐξαιτεῖσθαι—which the subjoined examples will prove not to be employed instead of the active ἐξαιτεῖν, except in the sense of begging so as to obtain, or in the confident hope of obtaining †.

stigia lymphis, | Purpureave tum-
um consternens veste cubile.
Catullus, lxiv. 161.

Suetonius, Caius 26: Modo ad pedes stare succinctos linteo passus est—Idem, Vitellius, 2: Pro maximo munere a Messalina petiit, ut sibi pedes præberet ex calceandos—Plutarch, De Virtutibus Mulierum, Operum vii. 23, 24: ἐσπέρας δὲ πρὸς ἐκάστην ἀνὰ μέρος βαδίζουσαι, διηκονοῦντο τοῖς ἀλλήλων γονεῦσι καὶ ἀδελφοῖς, ἄχρι τοῦ καὶ τοὺς πόδας ἀπονίζειν—Pompeius, 73: καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν, ἐκ τούτου περιέπων καὶ θεραπεύων ὅσα δεσπότης δοῦλοι, μέχρι νύφews ποδῶν καὶ δείπνου παρασκευῆς, διετελεσεν—Clemens Alexandrinus, i. 620. 4. Strom. iv. 19: ἡ δὲ Κλεοβούλου θυγάτηρ τοῦ σοφοῦ καὶ Δινδίων μοναρχούντος, τῶν ξένων τῶν πατρῶων οὐκ ᾔδειτο ἀπονίπτειν τοὺς πόδας—Heliodorus, Æthiopica, ii. 22: καὶ ἡ μὲν τις ἀπένιζε τὸ πόδε, καὶ τῆς κόνεως ἡλευθέρου τὰ ὑπὸ κνήμην, κ', τ. λ. Cf. also the anecdote recorded by Sozomen, E. H. i. xi. 417. B. of Spyrido, bishop of Trimythus, in Cyprus, in the time of Constantine. Also, ii.

ii. 443. B. what is related of the empress Helene, mother of Constantine, at Jerusalem. See likewise v. vi. 602. C.

* Cf. Clemens Alex. i. 597. 2. Strom. iv. 9: where this text is quoted thus: ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος, Ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς, λέγει, σινιάσαι ἐγὼ δὲ παρητησάμην.

† Ἡμᾶς γε μὲν δὴ, ναῦν τ', ἀκῆρατον σκάφος, | ἦτοι τις ἐξέκλεψεν, ἡ ἔξητήσατο, | θεὸς τις, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, οἶακος θιγών. Æschylus Agam. 644—τοὺς γὰρ κάτω σθένοντας ἐξητησάμην | τύμβου κυρῆσαι, κείς χέρας μητρὸς πεσεῖν. Euripides, Hecuba, 49—τοσόνδε μοι παράσχετ' ἐξαιτουμένη. Hippolytus, 706—ἔγραψεν ἡ δύστηνος ἐξαιτουμένη. Ibid. 854—εἴ πως τὰ πρόσθε σφάλματ' ἐξαιτούμενος. Andromache, 54—ἡ παρθεναίαν πατρὸς ἐξητήσατο. Troades, 975—στεῖχωμεν ἡμεῖς, Κάδμε, κάξαιτώμεθα | ὑπὲρ τε τούτου, κ', τ. λ. Bacchæ, 341—πρῶτον γὰρ τόδ' ἐξαιτήσομαι. Heraclidæ, 475—ἀλλ' ἐν βραχεὶ δὴ τήνδ' ἔμ' ἐξαιτεῖ χάριν. Sophocles, Œdip. Col. 586. Cf. 1327—ἡμέας ἐξαιτέονται. Herodotus, Calliope, 87—ἡ δὲ μήτηρ

The meaning of the declaration, then, is not that Satan had merely *desired to have*, but that he had actually got possession of, the Apostles; they had been given up to his desire; to be sifted as wheat. Now the object of sifting wheat, universally, being to separate the grain from the chaff*, this surrendering of the Apostles to Satan for such a purpose, which is spoken of as already past, and even though future was manifestly near at hand, was designed for the probation of their faith and constancy; which of them should continue firm, and which should prove a castaway: which in short should be the wheat, and which the chaff. A similar metaphor occurs, Amos ix. 9: I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve; yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth. But it was not so with the Apostles: one of them would be lost. The declaration, therefore, accords best to the supposition of a time posterior to the final apostasy of Judas; of whom Satan had now got and would retain possession. It is memorable however on another account; viz. as leading to a second prediction of the denials of Peter; which also results so naturally from the passing conversation, that it can on no principle be confounded with the former.

VIII. After this, there is no reason why Luke xxii. 35–38 should not be supposed to follow consecutively, until a period of time when the Paschal solemnity as

ἐξαιτησαμένη αὐτόν. Xenophon, Anab. i. 1. §. 3—φεύγοντας δὲ ὕμᾱς ἐκ τῶν πόλεων ἐξητοῦντο. Lysias, xii. 97—ἐξητήσαντο δὲ κατ' οἶκτον. Jos. Bell. Jud. i. xxii. 1—Ἀνιλαῖον ἐξαιτούμενοι. Ant. xviii. ix. 7—ἐξητήσατο δὲ αὐτοὺς ἵνα δῶσιν αὐτῷ ὄραν προσεύξασθαι ἀδεῶς. Acta Polycarpi, vi. 39.—ἔθος δὲ πάτριον

ἦν Ἰουδαίοις, τὸ παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχοντος ἐξατεῖσθαι τοὺς κατακρίτους, ὥσπερ καὶ παρὰ Σαοὺλ ἐξητήσαντο τὸν Ἰωνάθαν. Theophylact, Operum i. 483. C. in Lucam, xxiii.

* Cf. Ecclesiasticus xxvii. 4: As when one sifteth with a sieve, the refuse remaineth.

such was manifestly drawing to a close ; the next event which *he* specifies being the departure to the mount. Here, then, I would place the introduction of the third and probably the last Paschal cup ; and with it the institution of the remaining member of the Christian sacrament. In this part of the first eucharistic ordinance Judas would consequently not partake ; though he must have partaken of the former.

IX. The next ceremony might be the singing or recitation, either wholly or in part, of the usual thanksgiving Psalms, called the great Hillel, or Psalm of praise, and consisting of the cxv. cxvi. cxvii. and cxviii. Psalms ; which the rabbinical writers inform us were not confined to the Passover, but wont to be used at the other feasts also. Maimonides, indeed, supposes them to be recited while the lamb was eaten^b : but this must not be too strictly understood. I place the Hillel here in obedience to the authority of St. Matthew and of St. Mark ; both of whom specify the singing of some hymn, as the last circumstance before the whole company went out. It is true that this hymn was not necessarily the Hillel ; and the singing of such an hymn, previous to the departure from the chamber, might have taken place with apparently an equal propriety after John xvii. 26.

X. The Paschal celebrity being concluded, still our Saviour and his eleven disciples might not immediately leave the supper chamber : and if they actually stayed there some time longer, this interval cannot be otherwise devoted than to the conversations, ending with the prayer of Jesus, which are successively recorded in the xiv. xv. xvi. and xvii. chapters of St. John. There is internal evidence that the subject-matter of these

^b De Sacrificio Paschali, viii. 14.

chapters is a series of circumstances and discourses, all of consecutive occurrence; omitted perhaps by the other Evangelists because they came between the close of the Paschal ceremony, and the departure to the garden; and therefore, according to his practice, supplied by St. John. It is manifest that, even so early as the end of the fourteenth chapter, the time was come when they must have been preparing to leave the place where they were: ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐν-τεῦθεν, though it may not amount to a command actually to set out, cannot imply less than that the time for setting out was at hand. Nor is it improbable that our Lord, who knew from the first all which was coming upon him, and whose invisible eye had accompanied the movements of Judas ever since he went out, would purposely delay his departure even after the supper was over; in order so to time his arrival in the garden, that the traitor might find him there.

XI. With the departure itself, when it actually took place, a circumstance specified by *all* the Evangelists, we must date the commencement of the second subdivision, laid down above. The time itself it may not be possible exactly to determine. But if we consider at what period in the evening Judas must have gone out, viz. before the shops were shut in Jerusalem; and at what period our Lord was apprehended, viz. before every body had retired to rest; and also what is asserted by Maimonides^c, that the eating of the Passover was always finished before midnight: we may see reason to conclude that it would be *before* midnight, rather than *after* it. And though the supper had not been begun until the first or the second hour of the night, still this would allow as many as four hours,

^c De Sacris Temeratis, vi. 12. De Sacrificio Paschali, viii. 14.

or even five, for the transaction of the intermediate events.

I assume, then, that our Lord set out for the mount of Olives in the last hour of the second watch of the night, between our eleven and twelve o'clock. The period of the year was the vernal equinox, and the day of the month about two days before the full of the moon; in which case the moon would be now not very far past her meridian, and the night would be enlightened until a late hour towards the morning. The suburbs of Jerusalem were full of gardens^d; and Gethsemane, as the name implies (denoting the place of the winepresses^{*}) was one of these, or in the vicinity of one of these: and Gethsemane, according to Jerome, was *Ad radices montis Oliveti*^e, and consequently to the east of Jerusalem: His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east^f: and, as we have seen from Josephus, it was five or six stades remote from the walls of the city, on the other side of the valley or torrent of Cedron^g—where, as Jerome also informs us, a church was subsequently built.

This quarter was on the road to Bethany; and the family of Lazarus might have possessions there. That for some reason at least our Lord was accustomed to resort thither is directly affirmed by St. Luke, who says that he went there according to his *wont*; and impliedly by St. John, who says that Judas also *knew* the place. The house, where the supper had just been celebrated, was probably situated in the eastern divi-

* Jerome iv. Pars i^a. 129. *ad* vallis pinguissima, which is in
med.: renders Gethsemani, by fact its literal signification.

^d Jos. Bell. Jud. v. iii. 2. vi. i. 1.
Nominibus. ^f Zech. xiv. 4.

^e Operum ii. Pars i^a. 451. De Situ et
^g 2 Sam. xv. 23. 1 Kings ii. 37.

sion of the city ; for the messengers, sent to prepare the supper, would enter it from the direction of Bethany, and may be presumed to have found the house almost as soon as they entered it. In this case, the distance to the garden would be somewhat more than the interval between the city walls and the mount of Olives, that is, about half or three quarters of an English mile : so that there was still time for the conversation recorded Matt. xxvi. 31–35. and Mark xiv. 27–31. to come to pass by the way ; a conversation, memorable on two accounts ; one, that now was delivered the prediction on which so much stress is laid by St. Matthew in *his* account of the resurrection, viz. that Jesus, after his resurrection, should precede his disciples into Galilee ; the other, that the turn of the conversation again led to the prediction of the denials of Peter ; and consequently to the third and last instance of the kind.

The distinctness and independence of these several predictions it is not possible, without running into the grossest inconsistencies, and sapping the foundations of historical testimony, to call into question. It is to be observed, however, that St. Matthew's and St. Mark's account of such a prediction being reckoned as one and the same, each of the Evangelists records only a single instance out of the three ; the fact of which number we are, consequently, left to collect from the comparison and conjunction of each of the narratives. But it is an instance, supplied in each case by matter peculiar to the Gospel which has specified it. It is also to be observed that the moral lesson, furnished by this most impressive and instructive incident, is wonderfully enhanced, if it appears, as it must now do, that the number of times for which it was predicted that Peter should deny his master ; and the number of times for which he protested, in the confidence of a genuine sin-

cerity, that he would rather die than deny him; and the number of times for which, on being put to the test so shortly after, he did deny him: were precisely the same. Nor is it more extraordinary that on three several occasions the futurity of these denials should have been simply predicted, than that on three several occasions, and much nearer in point of time to each other, the fact of three such denials should actually have taken place.

XII. The next event is the agony: of which St. John, though he brings our Saviour to the garden *before* it, and makes him to be apprehended in the garden *after* it, yet gives no account; and clearly because the other Evangelists had given a full account. Yet Paley has observed that in our Lord's allusion to his *cup*, xviii. 11. there is, even in St. John, a tacit reference to the thoughts and the expressions of the agony itself; such as might naturally ensue on so recent an event. The reconciliation of St. Matthew and of St. Mark, in their relation of this transaction, may be easily effected, as the Harmony will shew, down even to the *letter* of the narrative in each. I shall merely observe, that the concluding sentence of our Lord's address to his disciples, καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν, καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε, which most commentators have so inexplicably mistaken for ironical, (and what could irony have to do with so solemn and so serious an occasion as this, or with the frame of the speaker's mind at the time?) is to be interrogatively understood, like each of the preceding addresses: Sleep ye on still, and take ye your rest? Are ye sleeping, even for the little time which remains? It is enough; let it suffice you to have slept thus long; the hour is come, and the Son of man is delivered into the hands of sinners. This sense of τὸ λοιπὸν is the most common imaginable.

With regard to St. Luke, it may well admit of a question whether the supplementary character of *his* Gospel is not here to be strictly taken into account. It is true that he records no part of the agony except what plainly relates to the first trial, and the first prayer; and so far his account may appear more succinct than that of St. Matthew or of St. Mark. But, even in relation to this, he records certain particulars distinctly from them, which shew that he had it in view to supply their omissions here as well as elsewhere; viz. the appearance of the angel who strengthened Christ; and that most expressive token of the intensity of the agony, the bloody sweat. But for the sake of specifying these particulars, so characteristic and so affecting, we know not that *he* would have noticed at all, any more than St. John, an event circumstantially related as it was, by his predecessors.

Independently of these additions, his account, compared with their's, is studiously concise. On the second and the third repetition of the prayer in question, the violence of our Lord's emotion previously was sensibly diminished; and his mind was recovering its wonted composure. These, therefore, he omits altogether. And as to the rest, it seems to me that he proposed to supply a further deficiency in St. Matthew and St. Mark; viz. the account of what passed *personally* between Jesus and the EIGHT disciples, in contradistinction to what passed between him and the THREE, before and after the agony, respectively. They had sufficiently, or rather exclusively specified the latter; but had said nothing of the former.

Now it is evident from the testimony of St. John, that as the agony took place in the garden, so before the agony our Lord, and his eleven disciples, all entered into the garden; and after the agony, that Jesus

at the head of, or apart from the same disciples, went out from the garden, to meet the approaching band of Judas. Hence, if all the eleven, before and after the agony, were in the garden, though the three in particular might be nearer spectators of the scene, yet the eight also must have been partially witnesses of it: and though, before the agony, Jesus withdrew himself with the three to some distance from the eight, yet, after the agony, and before the arrival of the band of Judas, he must have rejoined the eight. St. Luke's definition of the distance, ὡσεὶ λίθου βολήν—to which he withdrew himself from those whom he supposes him afterwards to address, accords better to the case of the eight, left by themselves at the entrance of the garden, than to that of the three whom he took with him further on into it: for, from *these*, according to St. Mark, he went but a *little way off* before he began to pray; whereas λίθου βολή implies the distance of a stone's cast from a sling*; which could not be properly called a little way off, and would be much greater than could have permitted that clear view, especially in the night-time, of his mental and his bodily distress, with which these three in particular were favoured.

Jesus then, after addressing his last admonition to these three, as recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark, may be supposed to have gone on to the rest, left probably at the entrance of the garden: and if he found *them* asleep also, it would not be more surprising than the fact that he had found the three others, thrice successively, in the same situation before. Yet for *their* being found asleep St. Luke has assigned a reason, which might

* Tantum aberat scopulis, quantum balearica torto
Funda potest plumbo medii transmittere cæli.

Ovid, *Metamorphoseon* iv. 708.

indeed apply to the three, but is specified solely of the eight. They were asleep from grief and dejection of spirit; affections, which the course of events hitherto, the many ominous declarations of their Master respecting himself and them, the ingratitude and perfidy of Judas, by this time perhaps only too reasonably suspected, the power and agency of evil spirits, now permitted to molest and disturb them in some manner more than usual; but above all, sympathy with their Master, in the spectacle of mental and of corporeal anguish, so recently exhibited, however imperfectly, to their observation, were well calculated to have excited: to which we may add the natural effect of the lateness of the hour itself.

As all this would take place without loss of time, it might still be said with truth that Judas appeared, ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος: for instantaneous as this appearance might be, it could not have come so critically in the midst of our Lord's last address to the three Apostles, as not to allow him time to go forth, and to anticipate the entrance of the band, before its intrusion into the garden. We may conclude, then, this consideration of the agony by observing that its duration was probably a little more than *one* hour. The first, and by far the most intense, of its paroxysms seems to have occupied, proportionably, the greatest part of the time; and the duration of that, as we may infer from the words addressed to Peter on the first return, Simon, sleepest thou? hast not thou been able to wake *one hour*? was nearly an hour. Both the others, we may presume, would be transacted in half the same time; whence, if our Lord arrived in the garden a little before, or not later than, midnight, the whole would be over soon

g Mark xiv. 37.

after one in the morning, or the first hour of the third watch.

XIII. With regard to the subsequent events, the supplementary character of St. John's Gospel enables us to arrange them as follows. First, upon the approach of the band, our Lord issued from the garden for the purpose specified by that Evangelist; and those particulars ensued, including the prostration of the band, which are recorded John xviii. 3-9. The provision of lamps and torches, which is mentioned by St. John alone, might be no excess of precaution even in a moonlight night, especially two days before the full; but due to various conceivable reasons, which it is not necessary to specify.

Secondly, the supernatural impression produced, both upon the band and on their conductor, by the appearance and the address of Jesus, being now removed; the accounts of the other Evangelists may come in to fill up a perceptible hiatus in St. John's. For it is clear that at this moment, though he does not mention the fact, our Lord must have been arrested, or some attempt made to arrest him; if Simon Peter now drew his sword, (a fact which he does mention,) and began to offer resistance. At this point of time, then, the preconcerted signal, by which Jesus was to be recognised, might take place in Judas' stepping up to and kissing him; and if our Lord's address to him, in consequence of this act, is differently represented in St. Matthew and in St. Luke, respectively, the difference may be accounted for by supposing it to have been really made up of both: Ἰούδα, ἑταίρε, ἐφ' ᾧ πάρει; φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδως; The recognition of Jesus would be followed directly by the seizure of his person; and the seizure of his person

by the attempted resistance of Peter ; whose possession of a μάχαρα, or sword, is critically explained by Luke xxii. 8. and 38 : the owner of the other sword being probably St. John.

The suppression of the name of Peter, in the three former accounts, may be attributed to the circumstance of his being alive when they were written ; which would be an argument that none of these Gospels was later than the *eleventh* of Nero, which was probably the time when he suffered : and its mention by St. John we may attribute to the circumstance of his being dead when St. John's Gospel was written ; a conclusion, which is suggested also by John xxi. 19. The name of the wounded servant, likewise omitted by them, is similarly supplied by him ; but in return he omits, what they had mentioned, the fact of his immediate cure : a miracle, which proved so strikingly the prudence and composure of our Lord on this trying occasion. The rest of the narrative of the present transaction ; comprehending what Jesus said to Peter and to the multitude, before the cure of Malchus, what to the members of the Sanhedrim, or their confidential officers, who conducted the band, down to the time of the desertion and the dispersion of all the Apostles, except Peter and John who still followed him afar off : is easily to be reconciled together, as the Harmony will shew. The last fact in particular, as having been distinctly recorded by St. Matthew and by St. Mark, and yet as not creditable to the disciples themselves, St. Luke, with a becoming regard to their honour, does not unnecessarily repeat : and the anecdote, over and above all this, concerning the young man whose seizure and escape are next mentioned by St. Mark, and are peculiar to his Gospel, we have considered and endeavoured to explain

elsewhere^h. And now the apprehension of our Lord being complete, the subject-matter of the first division expires here.

The second division extends from Matthew xxvi. 57—xxvii. 2, from Mark xiv. 53—xv. 1, from Luke xxii. 54—xxiii. 1, and from John xviii. 12—28, all inclusive. The difficulties, if there are any, which belong to it regard exclusively the order of the examinations of Jesus, and the times of the denials of Peter. To consider each of these questions in its turn.

The first thing done with our Lord, as we learn from St. John, was to conduct him to the house of Annas; partly, perhaps, because in proceeding to the palace of the high priest, it might be necessary to pass by the house of Annas: for that palace, being somewhere contiguous to the temple, was probably situated in the northern division of the city; whereas the mount of Olives lay to the east*: partly because he was the father-in-law of the high priest himself: and partly and principally because he was also his vicar, the next in dignity to him, and the vice-president of the Sanhedrim. In doing this, however, from whatsoever motive, it seems certain that the band acted of their own accord, and not in obedience to any orders before received: for, according to John xviii. 24, (a notice parenthetically inserted, and to be taken in conjunction

* The exact site of the temple, according to Josephus' account, Bell. v. iv. 3. and v. seems to have been the north-eastern angle of the city wall, standing in that situation opposite to the Psephine tower on the north-west. The palace of the high

priest was most probably somewhere in the same division, between these two; though the modern delineations of Jerusalem exhibit it in a much different situation; viz. in the quarter called Mount Sion, to the south-west.

with verse 13, in order to explain what follows from verse 15—where the scene is evidently placed in the palace of Caiaphas itself,) our Lord was directly consigned, still bound and without any examination, to the high priest, as to the proper authority before whom his trial was to take place. With the arrival at the palace of the high priest, St. John's account begins to be so far joined by the rest; but the history of our Lord's examinations is still distinct in each: and if St. Matthew's and St. Mark's be both reckoned an account of one and the same examination, there are *three* such examinations on record in all.

I. An examination before Caiaphas, and Caiaphas alone, when Jesus was first brought in, and the assembling of any part of the Sanhedrim besides had not yet taken place; which will be peculiar to St. John: a supposition by no means improbable; first, from the hour when he would be brought in, which we shall see by and by was not later than two in the morning at the utmost: secondly, from the uncertainty respecting the time of his apprehension which must have preceded; in consequence of which the Sanhedrim, though they might be got together either wholly or in part after the event, could not have been ready assembled at any particular hour, in the palace of the high priest, expecting it: thirdly, from the demeanour of our Lord himself; who answers the questions of the high priest *now*, but declines to answer them on the next occasion; for that may justly imply that he knew himself not to be put *formally* on his trial now, as he certainly was then: fourthly, from the nature of the examination itself, which was purely preliminary, turning upon *two* points only, our Lord's doctrine and his disciples: or, as these topics were never alluded to again, being designed for the gratification of the private cu-

riosity of the high priest himself: fifthly, from the supplementary character of St. John's Gospel throughout, and especially in this part of his narrative, where nothing is recorded in detail by him which had not been passed over by the rest. It follows, therefore, that the insult also, now offered to our Saviour, as related at verse 22, though it might be the first of its kind, was yet a different incident from any thing like it which transpired afterwards.

II. An examination, about one hour, as I shall shew hereafter, if not somewhat more, later than the former, recorded by St Matthew and St. Mark; whose account of it is in every circumstance the same. This was an examination before the Sanhedrim; as might be inferred even from the circumstance that it is the only examination which these two Evangelists record, before the delivery up of our Saviour to Pilate: for, Our Law, say the Jews to the high priest Hyrcanusⁱ, forbids even a malefactor to be put to death, who has not been previously condemned by the Sanhedrim. Some examination, then, of our Lord by the Sanhedrim, before his condemnation and much more his execution, was necessarily to be expected: which examination, as far as regards St. Matthew or St. Mark, must be either this present one, or none. It is strongly implied by Mark xiv. 53, that the council had been convoked and came together, posterior to the arrival of Jesus; and the place in which they assembled was certainly the palace of the high priest, whither Jesus had been first conducted. Nor is this at variance with Matt. xxvi. 57: for though they were not actually collected when our Lord first came in, the assertion would still be true if they were got together before the ensuing examination itself. The interval of an hour, or some-

ⁱ Jos. Ant. Jud. xiv. ix. 3.

what more, would be abundantly sufficient for that purpose.

Of this examination, if it was really followed by another, no more, for an obvious reason, might be recorded by St. Luke than the fact of the injurious and insulting usage, which was heaped upon our Lord at its close. No such usage followed after the next; and it was too important a part of our Lord's humiliation, and too essential to the fulfilment of prophecy, to be lightly passed over. One article of these indignities themselves, such as is specified Luke xxii. 64, is a critical proof that Jesus was now, and had been before, formally put upon his trial. To have endured this particular kind of affront, he must have been bare-headed; and that to remove the covering of the head from an accused person, when brought to trial, especially in cases of a more aggravated description, was a practice among the Jews may be collected from Philo; *ἵν' ἐπικρίνηται γεγυμνωμένη τῇ κεφαλῇ, τὸ τῆς αἰδοῦς περιηρημένη σύμβολον, ᾧ ταῖς εἰς ἅπαν ἀναιτίαις ἔθος χρῆσθαι*^k.

III. An examination, also before the Sanhedrim, but omitted by the two former Evangelists, and therefore recorded by St. Luke; the fact of which I infer for the following reasons.

Because even in St. Matthew and St. Mark there is ground of presumption enough to authorize the belief of it; for they each say that, *πρωῖας γενομένης*, or *ἐπὶ τὸ πρωῒ*, the whole council consulted together, expressly upon the topic how they might put Jesus to death. Notwithstanding then the result of the previous deliberation, they were still at a loss about that point; and in order to remove this difficulty, they might call in our Lord before them again.

Because this examination in St. Luke is affirmed to

^k Operum ii. 309. l. 15—17. De Specialibus Legibus. Vide also Numb. v. 18.

have taken place *ὡς ἐγένετο ἡμέρα* ; which denotes the same time of the morning as *πρωίας γενομένης*, or *ἐπὶ τὸ πρωί*. It took place, then, *after* the examination on the one hand, and *at* the time of the consultation on the other, spoken of in St. Matthew and in St. Mark respectively.

Because the former examination clearly took place in the palace of the high priest, but this, as we may infer from verse 66, in the usual council-chamber of the Sanhedrim ; which, according to the rabbinical writers, was not in the palace of the high priest, but in the temple. In conclavi cæsi lapidis consessus magnus Israelis sedebat, ac etiam judicabat sacerdotes¹. This conclave was situated partim in sancto, and partim in profano ; that is, it stood upon the confines of the priests' court and of the men's. At the time of the former examination, so early in the morning, the temple would be shut up ; but at the time of the latter, viz. after the dawn of day, it would be open : and there is reason to conclude from Matt. xxvii. 1. 5, that the very consultation there spoken of was held in the temple.

Because by the use of the term *ἀνήγαγον*, prior to this examination, St. Luke may be thought to imply that this was a second instance of our Lord's being brought before the Sanhedrim.

Because he clearly makes *this* examination a later event than the injurious usage, which St. Matthew and St. Mark both specified as the direct and immediate result of the *former*.

Because the circumstances of the two examinations were materially different : in proof of which assertion it is sufficient to mention first, that two distinct questions, designed to make our Lord criminate himself,

¹ Mishna, v. 378. 3. iv. 255. 2. Vide also Maimonides, De Synedrio, et De Apparatu Templi, v. 17.

were now put; one, Art thou the Christ? the other, Art thou the Son of God? which before were put both at once: secondly, that they were put by *all* the Sanhedrim *now*, but by the high priest alone before: thirdly, that the answers returned by our Lord *now* were not the same with those returned by him before.

Because St. Luke may be supposed to refer to the preceding examination, as recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark, at verse 71, where he alludes to the same want of testimony, which had been the great difficulty before, as continuing still: yet of this want of testimony, and consequently of the meaning of the allusion couched beneath those words, it would not be possible, from the information which he supplies himself, even to form an idea. The chief motive to a second examination by the Sanhedrim was therefore still this difficulty; in order to remove which, they judged it most expedient to make our Lord furnish matter of accusation against himself, by his answers to such questions as, with that view, were purposely put unto him. Accordingly, the *legal* charge, on which they subsequently denounced him to Pilate, and demanded his death, the charge of blasphemy, was the very charge so elicited in his professing himself the Son of God. Not but that other reasons might cooperate to the same effect; such as a fuller attendance of the Sanhedrim at this time than before, the satisfaction of every remaining scruple, a determination to have positive and irrefragable proof of what they considered our Saviour's guilt; but principally perhaps the informality of the season when the former examination had been held; since, according to Maimonides^m, *Judicia neque noctu, neque sabbatho, peragere licitum erat—Non inchoant judicia noctu*: for this consideration

^m De Jurejurando, vi. 7. Dithmari Annot.

alone might require a renewal of the trial in the morning, even though their minds had been satisfied with the result of the examination during the night.

That they were scrupulously observant of the *forms* of their law at least appears, first, from the pains which they took to procure the *legal* number of witnessesⁿ, whose testimony, though false, might agree together; and secondly, from their condemning our Lord at last upon a *legal* charge, which required instantaneous death, the charge of blasphemy; and their taking him immediately to Pilate, as to the executioner of their sentence; which was all that they could do. The remarkable coincidence by which the Gospel of St. John, in his account of the cleansing of the temple at the first Passover, proleptically illustrates and confirms the truth of the material fact now alleged against our Lord by these two witnesses, three years after it happened; and with so much of misrepresentation as, while it justifies its being called a false witness, was yet possible and probable at that distance of time subsequently: has often been pointed out, and need not now be insisted on. All which I shall say about it is, that nothing can prove more distinctly the difference of the cleansing in St. Matthew or St. Mark from this in St. John, than the consideration that while each relates the fact of the cleansing only three days before, and the fact of the false allegation founded upon it, three days afterward, they are totally silent upon the matter of fact which gave occasion to the allegation itself. No such matter of fact occurred at the time of the cleansing which they record; and, therefore, if any such occurred at the time of the cleansing recorded by St. John, that cleansing must have been totally different from their's.

ⁿ Numb. xxxv. 30. Deut. xvii. 6. xix. 15.

With regard to the times of the denials of Peter, they synchronized with the first and the second of the above examinations of our Lord; that is, the first denial happened a little before the first examination, and the third a little before the close of the second. The second, therefore, came between the two.

For St. John informs us that when Jesus was first conducted to the hall of the high priest, which must have been from the house of Annas, Peter and himself followed him thither; and the other Evangelists, so far as regards the attendance of Peter, unanimously confirm St. John. He informs us also that being personally known to the high priest, and consequently to the keeper of his door, in this instance one of his female servants; (nor was the practice of having female doorkeepers unusual among the Jews, but on the contrary of great antiquity, μήτε τὴν θυρωρὸν ἐγγρηγορυῖαν^o being a statement of Josephus' with reference to the time of David;) he spoke to her in behalf of Peter, who had not yet ventured to come in; and so brought him into the palace also. At this time, as each of the accounts attests, it was early in the morning; and it being likewise the spring-time of the year, the night, always cold in Judæa, was perhaps more so than usual: and consequently a fire had been lighted in the lower part of the hall to warm the parties present; down by which Peter sat with the rest, to observe, as we are told, the event.

Hereupon, as we are informed by St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, (and it is by no means inconsistent with the account of the same thing by St. John,) the female who kept the door, and had recently let him in, and whose suspicions of the fact had probably been raised by the very circumstance of John's speak-

^o Ant. Jud. vii. ii. 1.

ing to her *in* his behalf, challenged him as a disciple of Jesus *. It is implied by her words that she knew John to be such a disciple; and, therefore, she would conclude that one of *his* friends must be so too. Or at least, as Peter was obviously a stranger, and did not belong to the house, it was a natural inference that he would not have ventured to come in, if he had not been, in some way or other, connected with Jesus; who had been recently brought thither, and who was still there.

As to any difference in the terms of her address to him, this is of no moment in the harmony of the several accounts. The same fact is implied substantially under all its forms; and the simplicity of the Gospels, like that of every inartificial and unrefined history whatever, in all such instances as these, instead of indirect narration, proceeding from the historian himself, prefers to convey the plainest matter of fact, relating to any person's conduct, in the shape of something said directly by him: which must yet be considered equivalent to indirect narration. The first denial now took place; and to judge from the course of circumstances, as it took place so soon after the arrival in the hall, it might be prior, but it could not be posterior, to the first examination.

With regard to the second and the third denials, if there is any difficulty, it arises out of the conciseness of the several accounts. On each of these occasions, more parties than one taxed Peter with his relation to Jesus simultaneously; to whom however he made answer, in general terms, at once.

After being challenged by the maiden, he withdrew from the centre of the hall to the προαύλιον, where

* So Theophylact, i. 738. D. In Joh. xviii.

however, as St. John implies, he would not be altogether out of the reach of the fire. Here, according to St. Mark the same maiden, whose proper station was also the porch; and according to St. Matthew another maiden, most probably one of her companions; and according to St. Luke and St. John others in general, whose curiosity, or whose suspicions, might have been excited by what had passed already; repeated the challenge, and the second denial took place.

After this, and perhaps to avoid the vicinity of the woman who had recognised him twice, and whom he might leave at her post in the porch; or to support the character of a stranger with so much the more confidence; Peter must have returned to his former station near the fire, and even mixed in the conversation passing around him; for which, as St. Luke shews, there would be ample time; until some of the company, remarking the peculiarity of his dialect which was the Galilean, according to the united testimony of the three Evangelists taxed him on that very account with being a follower of the Galilean; and one of them in particular, a kinsman of Malchus, charged him, according to St. John, with having seen him in the garden. If this man had witnessed the violence experienced by his relation, and that at the hands of Peter, his recognising him now was exceedingly natural and probable. To these general attacks Peter returned the most positive and the most aggravated denial of all: and now it was, that the look of Jesus, who was still present at the upper end of the hall, turning about critically at this moment, and steadily fixing his eyes upon Peter, recalled him to a pungent sense of his misconduct; reviving the recollection of his Master's predictions, and overwhelming him with the consciousness of his own fulfilment of them. There is no

circumstance in our Lord's examinations more impressive than this, or by its moral beauty more calculated to illustrate the benignity of his own disposition, and the instinctive force of conscience. We are indebted for it exclusively to St. Luke; and it shews that Jesus' second examination was now going on, and to judge from what follows almost arrived at a close. St. Mark, however, specifies in the liveliest manner the effect produced upon Peter by the glance—ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιε—he drew his mantle over his head, so should the word be rendered*, (before or while doing which he must immediately have gone out,) and wept.

The account of these denials, then, is clearly interposed between the first and the second examination of Jesus: the times of the denials will consequently be the times of those examinations, or nearly so: and these times are ascertained by the crowing of the cock. Directly after the first, the cock crew for the first time, and directly after the third, for the second. The second denial, too, followed sooner after the first, than the third after the second; which we have seen was otherwise a probable effect: for between the second and the third, Luke xxii. 59, compared with Mark xiv. 70, shews that there was something less than *one* hour; which Luke xxii. 58. alone must prove could not have been the case between the second and the first.

Now if John xiii. 38, Matt. xxvi. 34, 75, Luke xxii. 34, 61, be all compared with Mark xiv. 30, 72, it will appear that whereas, in predicting these denials, our Lord actually said, Before the cock crow *twice*, thou

* Yet that ἐπιβάλλω may bear the sense given it in the authorized version, appears from Herodian, viii. 9: ἐπέβαλόν τινες τῶν τεχνιτῶν, in the sense of *took no-*

tice, observed, &c. Cf. Marcus Antoninus, De Rebus Suis, x. 30: τούτῳ γὰρ ἐπιβάλλον ταχέως ἐπλήρησεν τῆς ὀργῆς.

shalt deny me *thrice* ; which the event also proves to have been the case, but St. Mark only specifies accordingly ; the other three say simply, Before the cock *crow* thou shalt deny me thrice. It follows, therefore, that they mean the *second* of the above cock-crowings, and by the *second*, the period of the night ordinarily known by the name of cock-crow ; for none else could be specified either as a limit of time under any circumstances, or ἀπλῶς in this particular instance, but that. They imply then that whensoever the three denials might begin, they would be all over before the time of cock-crow ἀπλῶς ; which was a definite time of the night.

The night being divided into four watches, of three hours each, beginning at sunset in the evening and ending at sunrise in the morning ; a fact which is too notorious to require any proof ; this time coincides with the end of the third, and the beginning of the fourth, watch of the night ; or, about the time of the vernal equinox, with three in the morning. Hence the propriety of the following divisions of time in St. Mark, xiii. 35 : ὁψέ, which stands for the close of the first watch ; μεσονυκτίου, which stands for the close of the second ; ἀλεκτοροφωνίας, which denotes the end of the third ; and πρωί, which is sunrise in the morning, and therefore the end of the fourth. Speaking of the habits of the domestic cock, Cum sole, says Pliny^p, eunt cubitum, quartaque castrensi vigilia ad curas laboremque revocant : which defines the time of cock-crow very exactly.

Et jam quarta canit venturam buccina lucem ;

Ipsaque in Oceanum sidera lapsa cadunt.

Propertius, iv. iv. 63.

The same time was called περὶ ὄρθρον, and in reference

to the cock's crowing about that time we meet with such passages as these :

οἳ με φίλοι προδιδοῦσι, καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλουσί τι δοῦναι
ἀνδρῶν φαινομένων· ἀλλ' ἐγὼ αὐτομάτῃ
ἐσπερίῃ τ' ἔξειμι, καὶ ὀρθρίῃ αὖθις ἔσειμι,
ἦμος ἀλεκτρύνων φθόγγος ἐγειρομένων.

Theognis, Poetæ Minores, i. 859.

ὁ δ' ὀρθριος ἄλλον ἀλέκτωρ
κοκκύσδων νάρκαισιν ἀνηραῖσι διδοίη.

Theocritus, Idyll. vii. 123.

νεύμεθα κἄμμες ἐς ὄρθρον, ἐπεὶ κα πρᾶτος αἰοιδὸς
ἐξ εὐνᾶς κελαδήσῃ, ἀνασχὼν εὐτριχα δειράν. Idyll. xviii. 56.

ὁπότεν μόνον ὄρθριον ἔσῃ,
ἀναπηδῶσιν πάντες ἐπ' ἔργον. Aristophanes, Aves, 488.

Besides this, however, there were two other cock-crowings, one before it, the other after it; one or both of which are alluded to in the following passages. It is the second of the three, which is the ἀλεκτοροφωνία, ἀπλῶς; and which must always be understood, unless where any other is specially mentioned.

Thus in Babrius' poetical version of the Fables of Æsop.

ὁ δ' ἐκ πεταύρου κλαγγὸν εἶπε βοήσας (lege βωστρήσας)
πόθεν μαθήσῃ πόσσον εἰς ἔω λείπει,
τὸν ὠρονόμον θύσας με— Suidas, Πέταυρα P.

Cicero, De Divinatione, ii. 26 : Qui quidem silentio noctis, ut ait Ennius,

Favent faucibus rursis cantu,
Plausuque premunt alas.

Quir etiam gallum, noctem explodentibus alis,
Auroram clara consuetum voce vocare,
Nenu queunt rapidei contra constare leones?

Lucretius, iv. 714.

Jamque pruinosis molitur Lucifer axes;
Inque suum miseros excitat ales opus.

Ovid, Amorum i. vi. 65.

Nunc etiam somni pingues, nunc frigidus humor:
Et liquidum tenui gutture cantat avis. Ibid. i. xiii. 7.

p Vide Fabb. Æsopææ, 369.

Non vigil ales ibi cristati cantibus oris

Evocat Auroram. Ovid, Metamorphoseon xi. 597.

Nocte Deæ Nocti cristatus cæditur ales,

Quod tepidum vigili provocat ore diem. Fasti, i. 455.

Jam dederat cantum lucis prænuntius ales,

Cum referunt juvenes in sua castra pedem. Ibid. ii. 767.

Hæc ille, et si quæ miseri novistis amantes,

En! matutinis obstrepit alitibus. Propertius, i. xvi. 45.

Tunc queror in toto non sidere pallia lecto,

Lucis et auctores non dare carmen aves. Ibid. iv. iii. 31.

Nondum cristati rupere silentia galli,

Murmure jam sævo, verberibusque, tonas.

Martial, ix. 69. In Magistrum ludi.

Surgite, jam vendit pueris jentacula pistor;

Cristatæque sonant undique lucis aves.

Ibid. xiv. 223.

Sub galli cantum consultor ubi ostia pulsat.

Horace, Sermonum i. i. 10.

Quod tamen ad cantum galli facit ille secundi,

Proximus ante diem caupo sciet. Juvenal, Sat. ix. 107*.

* Ὀρνίχες τρίτον ἄρτι τὸν ἔσχατον ὄρθρον ἀείδον.

Theocritus, Idyll. xxiv. 63.

In allusion to these times of cock-crowing among others, Censorinus divides the night as follows^q: *Tempus*, quod huic proximum est, vocatur *de media nocte*: sequitur *gallicinium*, cum galli canere incipiunt: dein *conticinium*, cum conticuerunt: tunc *ante lucem*: et sic *diluculum*, cum sole nondum orto jam lucet. In like manner Macrobius^r: Deinde *gallicinium*; inde *conticinium*; cum et galli conticescunt, et homines

* Dr. Mead too has shewn that the *voice of the bird* alluded to, Ecclesiastes xii. 4, is cock-crow, as such, more probably

than morning, or dawn of day. Vide Harmer, iv. 38, 39. ch. vii. obs. cxxv.

^q De Die Natali, xxiv.

^r Saturnalia, i. 3.

etiam tum quiescunt: deinde *diluculum*...inde *mane*. Servius, ad Æneidem, ii. 268: Sunt autem solidæ noctis partes secundum Varronem hæ: *vespera, concubium, intempesta nox, gallicinium, conticinium, lucifer*. diei, *mane, ortus, meridies, occasus*. de crepusculo vero, quod est dubia lux, . . . licet utrique tempori possit jungi, usus tamen ut matutino jungamus obtinuit. Ad Æneidem, iii. 587: Sane noctis septem tempora ponuntur: *crepusculum*, quod et *vesper: fax*, quo lumina incenduntur: *concubium*, quo nos quieti damus: *intempesta*, id est, media: *gallicinium*, quo galli cantant: *conticinium*, post cantum gallorum silentium: *aurora*, vel *crepusculum matutinum*, tempus quod ante solem est*.

* These divisions of the night are alluded to in a letter of Marcus Aurelius Cæsar, written to Fronto, from the neighbourhood of Naples, and describing the variableness of the temperature of that climate, in the course of the same night: Jam primum media nox tepida, Laurentina. tum autem gallicinium frigidulum, Lanuinum. jam conticinium, atque matutinum, atque diluculum, usque ad solis ortum, gelidum Adalgidum maxime.—Frontonis Opera inedita, Epp. ad Marcum Cæs. lib. ii. 1. p. 69.

Suidas, Κήρυξ. ὁ ἀλεκτρυών· τρίτον δὲ ἄδει. Ammianus Marcellinus, xxii. 14. 331: Casium montem . . . unde secundis galliciniis videtur primo solis exortus. Gesta Petri, 61. (PP. Apostolici, 775. E.) ἄρτι δὲ περὶ τὰς δευτεραίας τῶν ἀλεκτρυόνων ὥδ' ἀναστὰς, κ', τ. λ. Cf. also Clementina Homilia 3^a. 1. Ibid. 576. B.

Plutarch, Aratus, 7, 8: ὁ τὴν ἐωθινήν φυλακὴν παραδιδούς ἐφώδευε κώδωνι . . . ἡ δὲ ὥρα κατήπει-

γεν, ἥδη φθεγγομένων ἀλεκτρυόνων, καὶ ὅσον οὖπω τῶν ἐξ ἀγροῦ τι φέρειν εἰωθότων πρὸς ἀγορὰν ἐπερχομένων... ἡμέρα μὲν ὑπέλαμπεν ἤδη. Aristides, xxvi. 512. l. 4: ἀλεκτρυόνων δὲ ὥδ' αἱ πλησίον ἦσαν . . . ἅμα δὲ τῇ ἔφ, κ', τ. λ. Idem, xxvii. 535. l. 14: καὶ περὶ ἀλεκτρυόνων μάλιστα πῶς ὥδ' ἀνύσας εἰς Μύριναν . . . καὶ δὴ ἐωσφόρος τε ὑπερείχε, καὶ φῶς ἡμέρας ὑπέφαιεν—iii Macc. v. 23: ἄρτι δὲ ἀλεκτρυόνων ἐκεκράγει ὄρθριος . . . 24. τὴν πρωΐαν . . . 26. οὖπω δὲ ἡλίου βοῶναι, κ', τ. λ. Plutarch, De Oraculorum Defectu, vii. 645: οὕτε ὁ Σοφοκλέους Ἀδμητος· οὐμός δ' ἀλέκτωρ αὐτὸν ἦγε πρὸς μύλην: unless, indeed, ἀλέκτωρ is here, my husband: Alcestis being the speaker. Cf. upon the same subject, Anthologia, i. 22. Meleagri lxxii: 37. cxxiii. 7, 8: ii. 96. Antipatri Thessalonicensis v: ii. 105. Ejusdem xxxix.

It is mentioned by Pausanias, v. 25: that the shield of Idomeneus, a descendant of the sun, had the device of a cock upon it, for the following reason: Ἴδο-

Each of these authorities, therefore, places the *gallicinium* between the beginning of the *conticinium*, and the end of the *de media nocte*: that is, the first cock-crow was supposed to be just after the latter, and the third just before the other: whence, if these were equal divisions of time, the first cock-crow would be as much after midnight, as the third would be before morning; and morning, *πρωϊ*, or *mane*, being always determined by sunrise, at the equinox, when the sun rises at six, the *diluculum* begins about five, and the *antelucem*, or *conticinium*, about four.

μενὺς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀπόγονος Μίνω· τῷ δὲ Ἰδομενεί γένος ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑλλίου τοῦ πατρὸς Πασιφάης· Ἑλλίου δὲ ἱερὸν φασιν εἶναι τὸν ὄρνιθα, καὶ ἀγγέλλειν ἀνιέναι μελλοντος τοῦ ἡλίου. In like manner, Plutarch, De Pythiæ Oraculis, vii. 575, tells us of an artist who, to express morning, painted a cock on the hand of Apollo; and (Eckhel, i. 212.) from the same connexion of this bird with *day*, *ἡμέρα* or *ἡμέρα*, the coins of Himera in Sicily had the image of a cock upon them.

Cf. Pollux, Onomasticon, i. cap. 7. §. 8: Heliodorus, Æthiopica, i. 18: Basil, Operum i. 107. D: Theophylact, i. 255. C. In Marc. xiv. and 478. C. in Luc. xxii.

Cock-crow, as such, was an important time in the observances of the primitive church. The great fast, in Passion-week, which began on the Parasceue or Friday, was appointed to terminate at it. Vide Constitutiones Apostolicæ, v. 15. PP. Apostolici, 255. C. D: 18. 258. D. E: 19. 259. B: Rel. Sacræ, ii. 385. 17: 386. 2: 390. 13: SS. Dep. Vaticana Collectio, i.

66. A. B: Eusebii Quæstiones ad Marinum, ii: Epiphanius, i. 1105. D. Expositio Fidei, xxii. &c. The Apostolical Constitutions make it one of the stated times of prayer, viii. 34. 365. D. E: διὰ τὸ τὴν ὥραν (supple *ἐκείνην*) εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς ἡμέρας εἰς ἐργασίαν τῶν τοῦ φωτὸς ἔργων. Cf. Ambrose, Operum i. 112. C. Hexaëmeron, v. xxiv. §. 88. and ii. 1061. D. Epistolæ, lxi. §. 3. and 1219. A—D. Hymnus i. It was a common notion, too, that cock-crow was the actual time when our Lord rose from the dead. Prudentius, Operum i. 5. Cathemerinon i. i. Ad Galli Cantum. Ales diei nuntius | Lucem propinquam præcinit; | Nos excitator mentium | Jam Christus ad vitam vocat. 1—4. Vox ista qua strépunt aves, | Stantes sub ipso culmine, | Paulo ante quam lux emicet, | Nostri est figura iudicis. 13—16. Inde est, quod omnes credimus | Illo quietis tempore | Quo gallus exsultans canit, | Christum redisse ex inferis. 65—68.

At the equinox, therefore, the last cock-crow would be supposed to be about four in the morning*; and consequently the first about two, and the second about three: for experience shews that between two successive cock-crows, as such, the interval is commonly one hour: from which natural effect, too, the division of time itself, as founded upon it, must have been originally taken. The observation of experience is confirmed by what happened in the present instance. Between the second and the third of Peter's denials, which means in fact between the first and the second of the cock-crowings in question, there was this interval of time.

The time, then, of St. Peter's denials, and the time of the first and the second of our Lord's examinations, being both nearly limited by the first and the second of the crowings of the cock, would both be comprehended between a little before two, and a little after three, in the morning; a conclusion which is perfectly agreeable to the whole course of events *before* Jesus was brought to the palace of the high priest, and to the whole course of events *after* that. The second examination having been finished soon after three, it would begin to be day, as St. Luke expresses it, soon after four; and the third having been speedily completed, our Lord might be taken to Pilate soon after five; a time which St. John would naturally describe by *πρωτα*, because earlier than sunrise or *πρωι*, though

* This coincidence is very plainly expressed in Virgil's poem, called *Moretum*, lines 1, 2. *Jam nox hibernas bis quinque peregerat horas, | Excubitorque diem cantu prædi-*

xerat ales: whence it appears that the last cock-crow synchronized with the tenth hour of the night complete; that is, if these were equinoctial hours, with four in the morning.

much later than the dawn of day *. With this event the particulars of our second division will expire.

The third division is contained by Matt. xxvii. 3–31. Mark xv. 2–20. Luke xxiii. 2–25. and John xviii. 29–xix. 16. all inclusively.

The first circumstance in the order of its events is the repentance followed by the death of Judas, as recorded by St. Matthew only. The time and the place of this event were manifestly such as to come critically between the close of the last, and the commencement of this, division. That condemnation of our Lord, which is said to have produced this change of mind, is clearly referred by St. Matthew, (xxvii. 3.) to the condemnation by the Sanhedrim, xxvi. 66. before: it could have nothing to do with the condemnation by Pilate; first, because no such condemnation had yet taken place; and secondly, because that was not a distinct condemnation, independent of this, but merely the execution of the sentence of the Sanhedrim in consequence of this.

The abduction of Jesus to Pilate was not that he might be condemned afresh, but the necessary consequence of his being condemned already. The judgment of the council had pronounced him *worthy* of death; which, in the absence of the power of life and death, was the utmost they could do. But to give effect to the judgment it was necessary to resort to the civil governor. The abduction to Pilate, therefore, might justly be considered the sign and seal of our Saviour's death.

If all this was known to Judas, that is, if he had

* Philo Judæus, i. 7. 1. 29. De Mundi Opificio: οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν ἑσπέρα τε καὶ πρωῒα· ὧν ἡ μὲν προευαγγελίζεται μέλλοντα ἥλιον ἀνίσχειν, ἡρῆμα τὸ σκότος ἀνείργουσα· ἡ δὲ ἑσπέρα καταδύντι

ἐπιγίνεται τῷ ἡλίῳ. Πρωῒα answers to *mane*, which Varro also, apud Servium, ad *Æneid.* ii. 268. *loc. cit.* distinguished from *ortus* or sunrise.

been present, during the course of proceedings, from the time of the seizure of the person of Jesus, until now, or in any situation to have been subsequently a spectator of the event (which supposition there is no reason to call in question) then, if his repentance at the issue of his perfidy ever took place, it would most naturally occur at this critical moment, when the fate of his Master seemed to have been decided upon. With the motives of his repentance, which were probably connected with the motives of his perfidy, we have nothing to do. It is possible that he might not wish, or at least might not expect, such a result as ensued. He might suppose that our Lord would deliver himself at last by miracle; or that the violence of his enemies would not be allowed to proceed so far against him as ultimately to put him to death. Or, if he expected and even desired the result beforehand, still his conduct subsequently might be the simple effect of remorse; when it had come to pass.

If, however, the transaction between him and the Sanhedrim occurred at this point of time, viz. just after the abduction of our Lord to Pilate, then the scene where it happened, and the time of the day, are implicitly an argument that this abduction followed upon such a third examination, and at such a time, as St. Luke gave us reason to suppose. For the scene was certainly the temple, and the temple was the regular place for holding the assemblies of the council: the time was $\pi\rho\omega\iota\alpha$, a period earlier than $\pi\rho\omega\iota$, and, therefore, coincident with the time when preparations usually began for the morning sacrifice, which was to be offered a little before $\pi\rho\omega\iota$. Mane etiam, says Josephus^s, aperto templo, oportebat facientes traditas hostias introire: et meridie rursus, dum clauderetur templum.

^s Contra Apionem, ii. 7. p. 1244.

At this time, then, the Sanhedrim, or most of their body, would be in the temple of course; and it is clear that Judas was there too, a spectator, as it would seem, of the result: and if *he* was there in any such capacity, our Lord must have been there also. Consequently he had been removed from the palace of the high priest thither. Had not this been the case, the transaction between Judas and the council, which ended in his throwing down the pieces of silver, would have taken place in the palace of the high priest, not in the temple; for there is no reason to suppose he made choice of the latter intentionally. Our Lord's final examination, then, and his ultimate abduction to Pilate, took place in and from the temple. Nor do I think that the Providence of God, with a view to the preservation of the typical character in which he was to suffer, would allow them to take place in and from any other quarter.

The sequel of the history of the repentance of Judas, excepting his death which might have happened immediately afterwards, from 6-10. in St. Matthew's account, is manifestly somewhat proleptical. The purchase of the potter's field with the money returned by him must, in the nature of things, have been a later occurrence; which is specified now merely to make an end of the account. The allusion to the name of this field, as still current in the time of the writer, is one among other internal evidences that St. Matthew's Gospel was written early, and among the Jews, or on the spot. It is by a singular mistake, however, that the field in question has been commonly confounded with that other Aceldama, mentioned in the speech of St. Peter, Acts i. 19. as the scene of the suicide* of Judas.

* I call this a suicide; because *ἀπ' ἑξαιτίας* in St. Matthew's narrative admits of no other construction, but that of his hanging

That field was purchased by Judas, with all or with part of the wages of his iniquity, *before* his death; but this with the money returned by him, and *after* his death: that purchase must have been made on the Thursday, and certainly before the morning of the Friday, in Passion-week; this, either on the Friday, or on some day even later than that. But what is the chief distinction, the prophecy of Zechariah, xi. 12, 13. was fulfilled, and is cited as fulfilled, by this last purchase^t; whereas if the two fields were the same, unless the prophecy was twice fulfilled, it must have been fulfilled by the first.

The identity of name should constitute no difficulty. The name would be given to commemorate a common circumstance in the history of the fields, and would be equally appropriate to that circumstance in either case: in the one, as the scene of a remarkable suicide; in the latter, as still more justly entitled to the name, because bought with the price of blood, and that of the blood of our Saviour. Hieronymus, De Situ et Nominibus: Ager fullonis...ostenditur autem nunc usque locus in suburbanis Jerusalem—Acheldama, Ager sanguinis—qui hodieque monstratur in Ælia, ad australem plagam montis Sion^u: the import of which passages is to describe the two places rather as distinct than as the same.

himself. Thus, μετὰ δὲ, λέγουσι
ὡς ἡ παῖς ἀπήγατο ὑπὸ ἄχεος. He-
rodotus, ii. 131—Ἐκ τῶν δένδρων
τινὲς ἀπήγοντο. Thucydides, iii.
81—Ἀπὸ καλοῦ ξύλου κὰν ἀπάγα-
σθαι. Suidas in Ἀξίον. Vide also ad
Ἀπήγατο. Ἐκ τῶνδ' ὅπως τάχιστ'
ἀπάγασθαι θεῶν. Æschylus, Sup-
plices, 481—Εἰ ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν οἱ
τεθνηκότες | αἰσθησιν εἶχον ἄνδρες,
ὡς φασὶν τινες, | ἀπηγάμην ἂν

ὄστ' ἰδεῖν Εὐριπίδην. Anthologia
ii. 60. Philemon—*Η τριηρα-
χῶν ἀπήγατ', ἥ πλέων ἤλωκέ ποι.
Athenæus, iii. 62. Cf. Xeno-
phon, Hiero, vii. 13: Plutarch,
De Liberis Educandis, vi. 34:
Appian, B. C. i. 73: iv. 26:
Ælian, Variæ Hist. v. 8: Epictet-
us apud Arrianum, i. 2. p. 12:
ὅταν γοῦν πάθῃ τις ὃ τι εὐλογον,
ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγατο.

^t Concerning 30 pieces of silver as the price of blood, see Exod. xxi. 32.
^u Operum ii. Pars i^a. 407. 410.

With regard to the remaining particulars, or those which concern the examination of Jesus before Pilate, the same confession must be made of the difficulties which stand in our way, with the same qualification that the task of reconciling St. Matthew with St. Mark, or St. Luke with either, is comparatively easy throughout: but as to St. John, except upon one supposition, the business of reducing this part of his accounts to an implicit agreement with their's is the most arduous of any which we have yet encountered. On that one supposition, indeed, every difficulty is removed, and our work becomes simple and easy in the highest degree.

This supposition proceeds, as in other instances of a like kind, on the assumption of the supplementary relation of St. John's Gospel to the rest, at this period of a common history, as well as every where else. His account of the proceedings before Pilate, with the exception of a very little towards the end, is the relation of particulars entirely omitted by the former Gospels, and entirely supplied by his Gospel: with regard to which, the certainty of omissions in St. Matthew and St. Mark, expressly supplied by St. Luke, is a good argument *a priori* for the probability of similar omissions in all the three, expressly supplied by St. John. Now the mission of our Lord to Herod, which must have been one of the circumstances in the course of proceedings before Pilate, is a decided instance of the former description. Besides, we have seen too many proofs already of the peculiarity of St. John's manner, not to conclude that where *he* is the most diffuse, his predecessors must have been the most concise; and, *vice versa*, where he is the most concise, they must have been the most circumstantial. And it will be confessed that, up to a certain point in the detail of proceedings before Pilate, he is eminently minute and particular: which

may justly encourage the presumption that there, more especially, he had it in view, by the fulness of his own accounts, to make up for the deficiencies of the rest.

If this be the case, our business in this part of the Gospel Harmony is not to reduce the details of St. John to an agreement with those of the rest, as if all were the account of the *same* things; but to determine, if possible, the precise point of time where his narrative will terminate, and their's will begin: in other words, after *what* part of St. John's account we ought to insert their's, or before *what* part of their's we ought to place St. John's. For this purpose I shall endeavour to shew that there was a determinate period in the course of the proceedings before Pilate, after our Lord was brought to him, until which he was not examined in public, or *pro tribunali*; but after which he was: and that the circumstantial part of the narrative of St. John belongs entirely to the time before that point; the circumstantial part of the narrative of the rest belongs entirely to the time after it.

I. When Jesus was first brought to Pilate, the Jews, we are told, for the reason specified in the text, entered not into the Prætorium; and consequently Pilate came out to them. Hence it is evident that, as yet, neither they nor Jesus had entered the Prætorium: and while our Lord was still without, the conversation ensued which is recorded John xviii. 29–32.

II. After this Pilate returned into the Prætorium, and called Jesus in to him also; leaving the Jews his accusers, for the same reason as before, still without: and while he and Jesus were within by themselves, consequently while they were alone and in private, the conversation takes place between them, xviii. 33–38. as far as *τί ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια*.

III. Then Pilate, without waiting for the answer to

his question, issued a second time from the Prætorium ; by himself, and leaving Jesus *alone* within ; to speak to his accusers without : and the conversation recorded xviii. 38. from καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν, to the end of the chapter, now took place. In this was included the *first* express declaration of his conviction of the innocence of Jesus, and the *first* express proposal, in deference to the privilege of the feast, that he should be released, followed by the *first* express demand for the liberation of Barabbas in his stead. All this time, it must be evident that Jesus himself was still in the Prætorium, apart from Pilate, from his accusers, and from the multitude, who were all without.

IV. His proposal, for the release of Jesus, having been thus received, Pilate, as we shall see by and by, again left the people outside, and returned into the Prætorium a second time ; where Jesus was : and apparently with the hope of mitigating the people by the infliction of some chastisement upon him, caused him, for the first time, to be scourged by the soldiers of his guard, and arrayed out of mockery in purple.

V. For after this, we are told expressly, xix. 4, that he *came out again*, whence it is clear that meanwhile he must have gone in ; which will be the *third* time of his coming forth. But he came out alone ; for he informed the people that he was going to bring out Jesus unto them ; that so they might be convinced, from the manner in which he had decorated him, that he found no fault in him ; that he considered the charge of affected royalty as nothing serious or dangerous. Accordingly, Jesus did come forth, for the *first* time since his entering in, wearing the purple robe and the crown of thorns with which the soldiers had invested him. These particulars are all recorded, xix. 1-5.

VI. Hereupon, while Jesus was still in public, ex-

posed, and in such a dress, to the gaze of the people, the conversation ensued which is related xix. 6–8. including a *second* attempt of Pilate to procure his liberation.

VII. After this, however, it is evident that Pilate entered the Prætorium for the *third* time again, and either took Jesus back with him, or caused him to be summoned to his presence thither a *second* time, in order that the conversation between them, xix. 9–11. might take place, as before, within the Prætorium, and apart from the people.

VIII. When this was over, it is also manifest that Pilate must have come out again by himself, for the *fourth* time, leaving Jesus, as before, alone and within; or that *third* intercession with the people, which is recorded at verse 12. could not have taken place without.

Hitherto then there is no proof of any formal examination of our Lord at all, or of none which had been transacted in public: whatever had passed, which might be construed into an examination, had passed between himself and Pilate, within the Prætorium, apart from and unobserved by the people. Twice only, in the course of proceedings, as far as they had yet extended, had Jesus been visible without; once, when he was first brought to the governor, and again, when he was produced to the people, arrayed in the mockery of a kingly dress. But he had been speedily removed within; and at this very time it must be evident that he was still within.

IX. In consequence, however, of that last declaration of the people, If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend—every one who maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar; which implied a resolution, did he refuse any longer to comply with their wish, to

accuse him to Tiberius, or at least was to put the question upon a *new* footing, directly affecting his duty as the lieutenant of Cæsar; he brought out Jesus, we are told, (which clearly demonstrates that before he was within,) and consequently for the *third* time of his appearing in public; and sat down himself ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον Λιθόστρωτον. xix. 13.

Now what Pilate was thus doing, it is manifest he was doing in public: and what he was thus doing in public *now*, it is also manifest he could not have done in public *before*. But from the very terms of the account itself, from the mention of the βῆμα, as the seat on which he proceeded to sit, and from the name given to the place where that βῆμα was fixed, λιθόστρωτον, it must be evident that he was preparing to try our Saviour in a new capacity; he was sitting down *pro tribunali*, in his judicial or official character; in the ordinary place, and on the ordinary seat, where, as the deputy of Cæsar, as the civil magistrate, as the administrator of justice and the arbiter of life and death, he was accustomed to hear, and to decide upon, all causes brought before his cognizance.

It is well known to classical readers that the vernacular term *tribunal*, which expresses in the Latin language the seat of justice, is rendered in Greek by βῆμα; and the vernacular phrase *sedere* or *considerare pro tribunali*, which expresses in the same language the assumption of the seat of justice, as the preliminary step to the discharge of the functions of a judge, is also rendered in Greek by καθίσαι or καθῆσθαι ἐπὶ βήματος. If examples are wanted in proof of this position, the following passages will supply them. Καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος. Acts xii. 21—Ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα. xviii. 12—Ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος. Ib. 16—Ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος. Ib. 17—Καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος. xxv. 6—Ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος Καί-

σαρος. Ib. 10—Καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος. Ib. 17. Vide also Rom. xiv. 10. 2 Cor. v. 10.

Γενομένης κατηγορίας πρὸ τοῦ βήματος. Jos. Bell. Jud. i. ix. 2—Τῇ δὲ ἐξῆς ὁ Πίλατος καθίσας ἐπὶ βήματος. ii. ix. 3—Περὶστάντες τὸ βῆμα—Ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος—Ibid. 4—Βῆμα πρὸ αὐτῶν θέμενος. Ibid. xiv. 8—Μαστιγῶσαι πρὸ τοῦ βήματος. Ibid. 9—Καθίζει μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος. iii. x. 10—Πρὸ τοῦ βήματος . . . ἀπέλυσα. Ant. xiv. x. 13. 19—Ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα ἦκεν. xviii. iii. 1—Ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἀνέγνω. xix. vi. 3—Καθίσας ἐπὶ βήματος. xx. vi. 2—Καὶ βῆμα καὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον ὀνομάζεται, ἐφ' οὗ τις ἐζόμενος δικάζει. Dio Cassius, xlv. 12—Ἐπὶ βήματος αὐτῷ καθημένῳ. lv. 33—Ἐπεποιήτο μὲν γὰρ βῆμα ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ, ἐφ' οὗ προκαθίζων ἐχρημάτιζε. lvii. 7—Καθεζόμενος δ' ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος. Appian, B. C. v. 48.

It is known also that the tribunals of the magistrates at Rome were placed in the midst of a rising ground, or elevated area, the floor of which, at this period of their history, commonly consisted of that species of ornamental pavement, called mosaic or tessellated; of which many specimens still continue to be found. Pavimenta, says Pliny^u, originem apud Græcos habent, elaborata arte, picturæ ratione; donec lithostrota expulere eam. There is an allusion to these pavements as such, in the following passage of Lucilius^v:

Quam lepide lexeis compostæ? ut tesserulæ omnes
Arte pavimento, atque emblemate vermiculato.

M. Varro, De Re Rustica^w: Nuncubi hic vides citrum, aut aurum? num minium, aut Armenium^x? num quod emblemata, aut lithostrotum?

Lithostrota, continues Pliny, acceptavere jam sub Sylla: parvulis certe crustis: extat hodieque quod in

^u H. N. xxxvi. 60. Vide also Seneca, Epistolæ, lxxxvi. §. 5. ^v Apud Ciceronem, De Oratore, iii. 43. and Orator, 44. ^w Lib. iii. cap. 2. ^x De Minio, vide Pliny, H. N. xxxiii. 36—40. De Armenio, xxxvi. 10. Vitruvius, De Architectura, vii. 5. *ad finem*.

Fortunæ delubro Præneste fecit^w. The customs which use or fashion had established at Rome, whether in the administration of justice or in any other respect, were generally observed by the magistrates, both the imperial and the proconsular, in the provinces. Julius Cæsar carried such luxuries about with him even in his military expeditions: In expeditionibus tessellata et sectilia pavimenta circumtulisse^x *prodiderunt scilicet*^{*}.

* Cicero, Ad Quintum Fratrem, iii. 1: Villa mihi valde placuit, propterea quod summam dignitatem pavementata porticus habebat: and again; Pavimenta recte fieri videbantur. Philo Judæus, i. 157. l. 42. De Cherubim: καθάπερ γὰρ κονιάματα καὶ γραφαὶ καὶ πινάκια καὶ λίθων πολυτελῶν διαθέσεις, αἷς οὐ μόνον τοῖς χροῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐδάφη ποικίλλουσι, κ', τ. λ. Seneca, Epistolæ, cxiv. 9: Ut lacunaribus pavementorum respondeat nitor—cxv. 9: Miramur parietes tenui marmore inductos—Naturalium Quæstionum i. Præf. 5: Tunc juvat inter sidera ipsa vagantem divitum pavimenta ridere. Suetonius, Augustus, 72: Et sine marmore ullo, aut insigni pavimento conclavia. Arrian, Epictetus, iv. 7. 630. line 9: σοὶ μέλει πῶς ἂν ἐν λιθοστρώτοις οἰκήσητε, πῶς παῖδες σοι, κ', τ. λ.

Pliny, it is true, distinguishes between the *Lithostrotum* and the *Pavimentum*; but St. John's term *Gabbatha*, in Hebrew, or *Λιθόστρωτον* in Greek, would apply to each: and I consider it most probable that the *Pavimentum* as such is meant: as the preceding quotations them-

selves serve to imply.

The lithostrotum on which Pilate was now sitting down, no one, I should apprehend, would readily think of confounding with the lithostrotum mentioned by Josephus in his History of the War^y, as the scene of a remarkable exploit, performed by a single Roman soldier, named Julian, against an host of the Jews. Yet this confusion has been made by a critic of celebrity, Professor Hüg^z; which makes it necessary to say some few words concerning it.

That lithostrotum was manifestly the pavement of the outer temple. The Romans were already in possession of Antonia; and the contest was now τοῦ παρελθεῖν εἰς τὸ ἅγιον^a. At this time it was that Julian performed the feat ascribed to him, and by his unassisted valour drove the Jews μέχρι τῆς τοῦ ἐνδοτέρω ἱεροῦ γωνίας^b. This is a clear description of the *inner* temple: to which also the name of ἅγιον was properly applicable: τὸ γὰρ δεύτερον ἱερόν (the first court whereof was the women's) ἅγιον ἐκαλεῖτο^c. It is as plain an indication that the contest was

^w H. N. xxxvi. 64.

^x Suetonius, Vita, 46.

^y vi. i. 8.

^z Vol. i. 4.

^a vi. i. 7.

^b Ib. 8.

^c v. v. 2. Contra Apionem, ii. 7. p. 1244.

We have then the clearest evidence that, at this moment, Pilate was preparing to do something which he had not done yet; viz. to judge our Lord in good earnest, sitting officially and *pro tribunali*: which being the case, whatever had preceded this point of time, that is, the whole of the previous account, was either *extrajudicial*, either no examination at all, or an examination entirely preliminary and private. This point of time the narrative specifies in a manner which might be strictly applicable to it; for we have seen that our Lord would first be brought before Pilate about *πρωΐα*, that is, soon after five in the morning; and if we assign the space of one hour to the intermediate events, we assign what is abundantly sufficient for them, down to the time of this sitting *pro tribunali*; which would consequently be soon after six. And the Evangelist so defines it accordingly—*ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα. ὥρα δὲ ὥσεί ἐκτη*^e. There is no authority for changing this reading into *τρίτη* *—and if there

going on previously in the outer temple. Now as Julian was pursuing the enemy here, *κατὰ λιθοστρώτου τρέχων*, running over not *the* lithostrotum, but *a* lithostrotum, that is, over *a paved surface*, he stumbled and fell. There is reason to believe that every court of the temple was thus paved; and that the outermost court of all was so is placed beyond a question by Josephus himself: *τὸ δὲ ὑπαιθρον ἅπαν πεποικιλτὸ παντοδαπῶν λίθων κατεστρωμένον*^c. To the same effect the author of the work ascribed to Aristæus, or Aristæas: *τὸ δὲ πᾶν ἔδαφος λιθοστρώτων κατέστηκε*^d.

To suppose however that the tribunal of Pilate could have been placed in any court of the temple would be palpably absurd.

* It is very true that Griesbach has placed the various reading *τρίτη*, in his interior margin, preceded by the symbol \simeq , which denotes equality to the received reading *ἐκτη*. But I cannot subscribe to this opinion; and it may reasonably be matter of surprise that so accurate and judicious a critic should ever have inclined to it. Every MS. of note, and *all* the versions, exhibit the Vulgate read-

^c Bell. v. v. 2.
Josephus, Havercampii.

^d Eusebius, *Præparatio Evangelica*, ix. 38. 453. D. or
^e Ch. xix. 14.

were, it would be only to supersede a smaller difficulty by a much greater. The *third* hour of the day, if St. Mark is to be believed, was not the time when Pilate began to try our Saviour, before he delivered him to be executed; but the time when, his trial being over including many intermediate events, he was led away to his execution. There is no alternative therefore left except to embrace the hypothesis of Townson; viz. that the computation of hours by St. John is not the same with the Jewish or the Roman, but with the modern: the probability of which hypothesis has been strongly confirmed elsewhere^f. Nor is it any objection that the detail of proceedings before Pilate is thus made to begin at too early an hour. The habits of ancient times were very different in these respects from those of modern. Τὸ μὲν ὄρθριον, says Herodotus of Amasis king of Egypt, μέχρη ὅτου πληθώρας ἀγορῆς, προθύμως ἔπρησσε τὰ προσφερόμενα πρήγματα^g. Philo, Adver-

ing ἔκτῃ: and as to the other authorities which he cites, will any one believe that the autograph of St. John's Gospel was extant at Ephesus in the time of the Paschal Chronicle, perhaps six hundred years or more after the Christian era? (Cf. Rel. Sacrae, iii. 371. note.) Is the conjecture that the numeral note γ' might possibly be confounded with that of ς'. to be received as proof of the fact? It appears from the SS. Dep. Vaticana Coll. i. 92. B. that Eusebius proposed his conjectural emendation of the number in question early in the fourth century; yet he knew of no copy of St. John's Gospel, in which the numeral γ', supposing that to be the true, was

to be found. Vide also Theophylact, i. 748. B—749. C. in Joh. xix. In one word, is it not infinitely more probable that, if the original reading was ἔκτῃ, there would be a constant tendency to change it into τρίτῃ, that so the testimony of St. John might be reconciled apparently with that of St. Mark, than the contrary? For had the original reading been τρίτῃ, not one MS. or other authority, we may venture to affirm, would have exhibited ἔκτῃ: but if it was ἔκτῃ, it becomes a moral certainty that in the course of time, and in some instance or other, it would be found to be assimilated to τρίτῃ.

^f Dissertation xxi. vol. ii. 216.

^g ii. 173.

sus Flaccum^h also shews that this period of the day, viz. from $\pi\rho\omega\acute{\iota}$ or sunrise to the third hour in the morning, was the usual period for judicial proceedings: $\tau\acute{\alpha} \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \pi\rho\omega\tau\alpha \tau\omega\acute{\nu} \theta\epsilon\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu, \acute{\alpha}\chi\rho\iota \tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma \acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\varsigma \eta \tau\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\eta\varsigma \epsilon\zeta \acute{\epsilon}\omega\theta\iota\upsilon\omicron\upsilon, \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \eta\upsilon$. Between these times the exhibitions of gladiators took place at Rome; in allusion to which it was an order of Augustus, *Mulieres ante horam quintam venire in theatrum non placere* *ⁱ.

The particulars specified in the same account, from this time forward to the time when Jesus was delivered to be crucified, consist of only two or three cir-

* Dio, xxxix. 65: the fifth hour of the day was the time appointed by law for the beginning of public business at Rome. Ovid, *Amorum* i. xiii. 19. De Aurora, Atque eadem sponsum consulti ante atria mittis; | Unius ut verbi grandia damna ferat—Horace, *Epistolæ*, i. vi. 20. Gnavus mane forum, et vespertinus pete tectum—Sermonum ii. vi. 34. Ante secundam | Roscius orabat sibi adesses ad puteal cras—Ibid. i. ix. 35. Ventum erat ad Vestæ, quarta jam parte diei | Præterita, et casu tunc respondere vadato | Debebat—Juvenal, i. 127. Ipse dies pulchro distinguitur ordine rerum, | Sportula, deinde forum, jurisque peritus Apollo—xiii. 157. Hæc quota pars scelerum quæ custos Gallicus urbis | Usque a Lucifero, donec lux occidat, audit?

Philostratus, *Apollonius Tyan.* viii. 1. 373. A: $\eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\gamma \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \epsilon\pi\iota\tau\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota \eta\delta\eta, \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\iota}\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma \eta \acute{\epsilon}\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron \pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\delta\omicron\varsigma$: that is, to the em-

peror's tribunal, as of any other magistrate at Rome.

The following is Martial's account of the distribution of a day at Rome: *Prima salutantes, atque altera, continet hora; | Exercet raucos tertia caussidicos. | In quintam varios extendit Roma labores: | Sexta quies lassus, septima finis, erit. | Sufficit in nonam nitidis octava palæstris, | Imperat exstructos frangere nona toros. | Hora libellorum decima est, Eupheme, meorum, | Temperat ambrosias cum tua cura dapes. Epigrammatum* iv. 8. Cf. Virgil, *Georgica*, ii. 462: Horace, *Epp.* i. vii. 68. 75: ii. i. 103: Pliny, *Epp.* iii. i. 4, 5: Philostratus, *Apollonius Tyan.* v. 11. 238. B.

Hæc tot millia, ad forum *prima luce* properantia, quam turpes lites, quanto turpiores advocatos consciscunt. Seneca, *De Ira*, ii. 7. §. 3. *Mane* leonibus et ursis homines, *meridie* spectatoribus suis, objiciuntur. Idem, *Epistolæ*, vii. §. 3. Vide also lxx. §. 20.

^h Operum ii. 529. l. 30. Vide also Seneca *De Ira*, iii. 43. Vita, 44. Vide also Claudius, 34.

ⁱ Suetonius,

cumstances; and contrasted with the number and minuteness of the antecedent details, lead irresistibly to the conclusion that St. John was purposely as concise here as he had been copious hitherto: the truth of which conclusion will be placed beyond a question, if it can be proved that his predecessors had begun their accounts of the same things just where his own break off. In instituting and conducting the comparison of these accounts, I propose to take St. Matthew in conjunction with St. Luke; St. Mark being altogether the same substantially, though not quite so circumstantial, as St. Matthew; and all three, as I apprehend, beginning *their* detail of the proceedings before Pilate at the same point of time.

There are then two facts disclosed by St. Matthew's narrative—the first, the use of the phrase ἔσται ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, with its peculiar signification, the other, the message of Pilate's wife^k—either of which would prove that the date of this narrative is from the time when Pilate was sitting *pro tribunali*; and not before. The phrase in question is simply and purely forensic; denoting the formal or official constitution and appearance of an accused party, in the character of *reus*, φεύγων, or criminal, before a competent authority sitting upon him in judgment^l. It is the same thing in this sense as ἐπὶ constructed with the genitive, to denote a like effect; of which an infinite variety of examples might be produced^m. It intimates therefore, a point of time when Pilate was sitting officially upon Jesus as his judge, and Jesus had been brought officially before him as an arraigned party.

The message of the wife of Pilate, as it appears from the express testimony of St. Matthew, was de-

^k Ch. xxvii. 11. 19. ^l Compare Acts xviii. 17. xxiv. 20. xxv. 10. xxvi. 6. 2 Cor. v. 10. Mark xiii. 9. Luke xxi. 36. ^m Acts xxiii. 30. xxiv. 19, 20. xxv. 9. 10. 26. xxvi. 2. 1 Cor. vi. 1. 6.

livered to him *καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος*—that is, while in that attitude, and acting in that capacity in which the account of St. John left him. The presence of his wife with him in his government is critically explained by a passage of Tacitusⁿ: *Inter quæ Severus Cæcina censuit, Ne quem magistratum, cui provincia obvenisset, uxor comitaretur.* This motion was made U.C. 774, and it was negatived by the Roman senate. Now the message, if received at or after the point of time when he sat down on the tribunal, could not have been received before the close of St. John's account: that knowledge of the dream then, which this message communicated, could not be possessed before the same time. But if Pilate knew nothing of his wife's dream when Jesus was first brought to him, is it unreasonable to conjecture that it had not yet taken place; and consequently must have taken place afterwards? Suppose Jesus to have been brought to him soon after five, and the assumption of the tribunal to have happened soon after six; and proceedings to have gone on for some time before the message was communicated; nor was our Lord's trial finally over much before the *third* hour of the day: suppose also that Pilate's wife sent the message as soon as she awoke, after being disturbed by her dream: two conclusions would seem to follow; she must have had the dream after Jesus had been brought to Pilate—she must have had it, and she would naturally speak of having had it, *that day*. I consider this message therefore, a proof that she had not experienced her dream before Pilate assumed the tribunal; and consequently experienced it after. St. Matthew's manner of mentioning the message is such as to shew that it was interposed in the course of proceedings before and after it; Pilate was not beginning to sit,

ⁿ Annales, iii. 33.

but had been sometime sitting, *pro tribunali*, when he received it : and the final end of mentioning the fact at all seems to have been the desire of specifying one more, among the other reasons which would have prevailed with Pilate to release our Saviour, if the people could have been persuaded to relent.

This point then being presumptively established, we may arrange the order of events from that time forward, in conformity to it, as follows :

I. Pilate being seated *pro tribunali*, and Jesus officially arraigned before him, the accusation of the chief priests and of the rest of the Sanhedrim, as recorded by St. Luke : the nature of which was such as evidently to concern the jurisdiction of the lieutenant of Cæsar.

II. The question of Pilate addressed to Jesus, founded upon the previous accusation, and explained antecedently by it ; Art thou the King of the Jews ? with the answer of Jesus in the affirmative, (which is that *good confession*, witnessed before Pontius Pilate, referred to by St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 13,) recorded alike by all the three Evangelists.

III. The continuance, in the next place, of what may be considered the *reiterated* accusations of the Scribes and Pharisees, as attested by St. Matthew and St. Mark—and the silence of Jesus against them all ; a silence which excited the surprise of Pilate, and, to express that surprise, produced the repetition of his question to him.

IV. The address of Pilate to the leading men and to the multitude present, according to St. Luke—declaring his conviction of the innocence of Jesus, as founded upon the preceding examination ; which, if it was an attempt to procure his liberation, was the *first* such attempt in the course of *this* examination, but the

fourth which had occurred in all: then, their renewed accusations, denying his innocence; and from the mention of Galilee, arising out of those accusations, Pilate's inquiry if Jesus were a Galilean; and, upon finding that to be the case, (according to the common opinion that our Lord was born at Nazareth,) his sending him forthwith to Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee, (who was present himself in Jerusalem at the same occasion of the Passover,) as to his proper master.

This mission we may presume would take place about the end of the first hour of the day; or our seven in the morning; but not later. Of its probable motive—of the quarrel preexisting between Herod and Pilate—and of the reconciliation between them, effected this day, and in consequence, as it would seem, of this very act, something has been said in Dissertation xxxv. of the present work, to which I refer the reader. For the mention however of the fact, and for the account of what passed before Herod, to whom our Lord's accusers were sent as well as himself, similar altogether to what had just passed before Pilate, we are indebted solely to St. Luke. The going and the returning, with the transaction of the proceedings between, would necessarily take up some time; yet not so much but that Pilate might still wait in his seat upon the tribunal for the return of the prisoner, and of his accusers. His object in sending them to Herod might be not only to pay a compliment to that prince, but also to strengthen the argument for the release of Jesus; if it should appear that Herod likewise, as well as himself, had found no fault in him.

V. During this interval therefore, and while he was still sitting *pro tribunali*, I would place the message of his wife.

VI. Upon the reappearance of Jesus, whom Herod

sent back, clothed in the mockery of a royal dress, as he had been by Pilate, and with the same view in this instance also, viz. to express his contempt of the charge brought against him; I suppose those words to have immediately ensued, which conclude the account of St. John, xix. 14. from καὶ λέγει τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, to 15. inclusive, prior to the delivery of Jesus up to be crucified. In calling him their King it is manifest that Pilate was speaking ironically; and even the irony is naturally accounted for by the return and production of Jesus, still wearing the purple robe, which Herod had put upon him.

VII. The chief priests therefore as our Lord's accusers, and the rest of the multitude, being again assembled before Pilate sitting *pro tribunali* in his former attitude, and Jesus also being present in public, the language of irony is dropped, and the people are addressed in the serious manner recorded by St. Luke, xxiii. 13–16, concluding with a proposal to inflict a moderate chastisement on the accused party, such as might seem to be due for aspiring, however innocently, at the name of King; and so to let him go: the fact of which proposal, under such circumstances, is substantially confirmed by St. Matthew and by St. Mark; and makes the *second* instance of the kind since the commencement of *this* examination, but the *fifth* which had occurred upon the whole.

VIII. Though the proposal was rejected—yet was it renewed *once* and *again*; making together the *third* and the *fourth* instance respectively, since the beginning of this trial in public, but the *sixth* and the *seventh* in all: and these are instances recorded by each of the three Evangelists, and in terms, especially as concerns the second of them, very much the same.

IX. The obstinacy of the Jews remaining invincible,

Pilate now takes water; and to attest his own innocence in consenting to the death of Jesus out of deference to their importunity, performs before the eyes of the people the symbolical action recorded by St. Matthew alone.

X. This being done, and the sacrifice of Jesus to the will of the people being now resolved upon—as a necessary preliminary to the execution of his sentence, according to the custom of the Roman law *, he is first scourged with rods, and then given up to the insults of the soldiers, assembled together for that purpose †. The scourging took place in public, and was the second instance of the infliction of such violence upon our Saviour this morning; but the mockery was confined to the Prætorium, where the robe and the crown of thorns, spoken of here by St. Matthew and St. Mark, had been employed, as we learned from St. John, for a like purpose not long before; and would consequently be ready for the same use now. The purple robe, in which Jesus returned from Herod, either had been taken off from him before the address of Pilate recorded under Article VII. or would necessarily be removed from his person previous to the infliction of the scourging: and that putting of such a robe on again, which is here ascribed to the soldiers, might literally take place. Upon the detail of these particulars, both as something minutely related by his predecessors, and, as part of the history of our Lord's contumelious treat-

* Thus it is that Josephus, in a like case, specifies the conduct of Gessius Florus, as scourging certain Jewish knights before he crucified them: οὗς, μάστιγι προκακισάμενος, ἀνεσταύρωσεν. Bell. Jud. ii. xiv. 9.

† Compare with this account

of the honours paid in mockery to our Saviour, the description of the affronts put upon Herod Agrippa by the Alexandrian mob, as recorded by Philo Judæus, ii. 522. l. 26. et seqq. Adversus Flaccum.

ment in general, because they bore no indefinite resemblance to what had been experienced by him from the Sanhedrim before; St. Luke, with his usual regard to conciseness, is silent.

XI. The insults of the band being concluded, and Jesus being again clothed in his own raiment, he is finally consigned to the four soldiers who were to accomplish his execution; and led away from the Prætorium to be crucified. This fact is specified by all the Evangelists; and with it the third of our divisions expires. Before however we proceed to the fourth, it may be necessary to pause for the sake of one or two observations on the preceding account.

First; if upon its own grounds of probability, the position, that the detail of proceedings before Pilate, in the first three Evangelists, belongs to a different point of time from the detail of the same proceedings in the fourth, can be satisfactorily established; we are not called upon, and perhaps it may not be easy for us, to assign the reasons why this was the case. The former Evangelists had doubtless their motives for what they have done both in this instance, and in every similar instance, besides this. Among the presumptive causes, however, which may be supposed to have produced this effect, I would enumerate the following.

I. The course of proceedings before Pilate, from the time when he assumed the tribunal, acquired the appearance of a regular trial, conducted with the usual forms and solemnities of the Roman law; which it had not acquired until then. This point of time, therefore, constituted a new ἀρχή, a determinate period both before and after, from which, and with which, an historical account of the whole transaction might properly begin.

II. The train of events from this time forward tend-

ed directly to one consummation, the condemnation and the death of our Lord, as dependent on the instrumentality of the Roman governor. But to conduct the detail of proceedings, as soon as possible, to this conclusion; to shew how, and by what steps, the purpose of the Sanhedrim, in transferring Jesus to Pilate, was ultimately carried into effect; was that object to which the history of these proceedings would naturally be directed throughout.

III. The demeanour of our Lord also from the same time forward assumed a new appearance: for whereas in his examination before Pilate, apart from the people and within the Prætorium, his conduct exhibited no marks of reserve and no intentional silence whatever, yet now, on being produced to the multitude, and arraigned *pro tribunali*—saving that one reply to a question of the judge's, and not an accusation by the people, which St. Paul denominates *the good confession*—it does not appear that he so much as opened his lips. The same fact is observable in his deportment before Herod. It was now, consequently, that the language of prophecy, respecting this part of the Messiah's demeanour under his sufferings, the importance of which to its fulfilment we may judge of from the testimony of St. Peter, 1 Pet. ii. 21–23, compared with Isaiah liii. 7, began to be strictly verified by the event.

IV. The mission to Herod, and the consequent trial of Jesus before the tetrarch of Galilee as well as before the Jewish council and the Roman governor, was one of the incidents belonging to this period in particular; and the importance of that fact also to the fulfilment of prophecy may be estimated from the reference made to it, Acts iv. 27.

V. The account which the former Evangelists had given of these proceedings was clearly not complete or

continuous; as must appear from this consideration; viz. that the circumstances which they record, supposed to have happened consecutively, would not have sufficed to fill up the time within which they must have happened; that is, from *πρωτα*, when the council of the Sanhedrim broke up, to the third hour of the day, not long before which Jesus was led away to be crucified. But if those Evangelists had not given a consecutive detail of events, they must have given a partial; and however much they might have recorded, they must still have left something unsaid.

VI. The supposition of some such proceedings between Jesus and Pilate, as those in St. John, anterior to the proceedings in the other Evangelists, possesses its use in clearing up or explaining certain things which occur in them. As first; it would not have appeared from their account why the charge, brought against our Lord at the outset of his examination, was the specific charge of stirring up the people, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar; and why, ever after, this insinuation should lie at the bottom of any other subsequently advanced. It is seen however from St. John, that the other charges—charges more purely of a legal character—on which his enemies denounced him at first, having been urged and failed, the course of proceedings had of necessity conducted to this. Secondly, it would not have appeared why Pilate, without any examination, properly so called, of the prisoner, should so soon have expressed himself satisfied of his innocence. It is seen, however, from St. John, that he was convinced of it, or predisposed to acquiesce in such a belief, already. In like manner it would not have appeared how he came to know, or to conclude, that our Lord's accusers had delivered him up *through envy*: but St. John shews that he had seen reason

enough to suspect that. Nor would it have appeared why all at once, and without any previous statement of his motives for desiring it, he should have been so anxious to release Jesus instead of Barabbas ; nor subsequently why he should have been so reluctant to consent to his death at last. But it must appear from St. John that this was no new alternative ; and that his conviction of the innocence of Jesus, even before he began to try him officially, was so strong as not to be easily overcome by any considerations whatever.

The fourth division comprehends Matt. xxvii. 32–61. Mark xv. 21—the end, Luke xxiii. 26—the end, and John xix. 17—the end ; all inclusively. In arranging its particulars we meet with no difficulty which the supplementary character of the later Gospels does not easily remove. They may be considered in reference to four subordinate periods of time : I. from the time of leaving the Prætorium to the third hour of the day : II. from the third hour of the day to the sixth : III. from the sixth hour of the day to the ninth : IV. from the ninth hour of the day to the commencement of the sabbath.

The circumstances which belong to the first period are these :

I. The setting out of Jesus from the Prætorium ; a fact specified by all the Evangelists ; and along with Jesus of two others, malefactors and *λησται*—a fact which, though implicitly recognised by all, is mentioned in this, which is its proper place, solely by St. Luke, xxiii. 32. These men, as we conjectured elsewhere, were probably companions or accomplices of Barabbas, whom St. John calls a *ληστής* as well as them ; and whose execution, if his liberation had not been extorted by the people, would perhaps have taken place along with their's. With regard to the number

of soldiers by whom this procession would be escorted, as there were four appointed for the execution of Jesus in particular, there might be as many more for each of the two others; or twelve in all, under the command of the same centurion, who was consequently the thirteenth in number.

II. At a point of time which, as it appears from St. Matthew's and St. Mark's account, coincided with the moment of issuing from the *Prætorium*, the detention of Simon the Cyrenean, as he was coming from the country and casually passing by, to assist in bearing the cross of Jesus. The object of this detention was certainly not to relieve our Lord from his cross altogether—to carry which was, under all circumstances, a preliminary part of the punishment of persons condemned to be crucified*; but to divide the burden of it with him: for St. John is express that part of it, at least, was carried by our Lord himself; and the other Evangelists, especially St. Luke, are equally so that part of it was laid upon Simon. In this manner, therefore, it is probable they would proceed through the streets of the city towards the gate; one end of the cross, as we may conjecture, the upper, resting on our Lord, and the other end, consequently the lower, supported by Simon. The other two who were proceeding to their execution also, it is manifest, must have carried each their own; and we know not how far, in the case of our Lord, the weight of the cross itself, a solid and massy fabric of wood, large enough

* Charito, lib. iv. 66. l. 2: *προήχθησαν οὖν πόδας τε καὶ τραχήλους συνδεδεμένοι, καὶ ἕκαστος αὐτῶν τὸν σταυρὸν ἔφερε.* Cf. l. 6: *Πολύχαρμος δὲ τὸν σταυρὸν βαστάζων, κ', τ. λ.* Artemidorus, *Oneirocritica*, ii. 61. speaking of a man's

dreaming that he carried some of the divinities in Hades, if he be a malefactor, says he, *σταυρὸν αὐτῷ σημαίνει. ἔοικε γὰρ καὶ ὁ σταυρὸς θανάτῳ, καὶ ὁ μέλλων αὐτῷ προσηλωθῆναι πρότερον αὐτὸν βαστάζει.*

and strong enough to support a full grown man, compared with the physical strength necessary to sustain it—the visible diminution of his bodily powers through the various sufferings, mental or corporeal, which he had recently endured—the distance of the place of execution from the Prætorium—regard to the circumstance that he was not about to suffer as a malefactor, but as a person of acknowledged innocence, given up to be crucified for no fault of his own, but in compliance with popular importunity—or even the mere wantonness of authority—might induce the soldiers to lay this service upon Simon.¹

III. While the procession was on the way to Calvary, but not yet arrived at it, and probably while it was still passing through the streets of Jerusalem; the pause—which takes place by our Lord's turning round, and, in the terms of the prophecy recorded Luke xxiii. 27–31. addressing the crowd of females, inhabitants of Jerusalem, not those who had followed him from Galilee; who, with the natural compassion of their sex, and not concurring in the crime of the men, were weeping and bewailing after him. This pause, which no doubt was involuntary on the part of the soldiers, must have been produced by the same kind of awe which influenced the band in the garden.

IV. Calvary or Golgotha to which the procession was tending, according to Jerome, *De Situ et Nominebus*, was situated outside of the city upon the north-west: Golgotha . . . usque hodie ostenditur in Ælia, ad septentrionalem plagam montis Sionⁿ. Epiphanius, *Adversus Hæreses*, where he is accounting for the origin of the name, describes it as follows^o: οὕτε γὰρ ἐν ἄκρῃ τινὶ κεῖται, ἵνα κρανίον τοῦτο ἐρμηνεύηται, ὡς ἐπὶ σώματος κεφαλῆς τόπος λέγεται, οὗτ' ἐπὶ σκοπιᾶς· καὶ γὰρ οὕτε ἐν

ⁿ Operum ii. Pars i^a. 451.

^o Operum i. 394. C. D. Tatiani, v.

ὑψεῖ κείται παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους τόπους· ἀντικρὺς γάρ ἐστι τὸ τοῦ Ἑλαιῶνος ὄρος ὑψηλότερον· καὶ ἀπὸ σημείων ὁκτῶ ἡ Γαβαῶμ ὑψηλοτάτη· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἄκρα, ἡ ποτὲ ὑπάρχουσα ἐν Σιών, νῦν δὲ τμηθεῖσα, καὶ αὐτὴ ὑψηλοτέρα ὑπῆρχε τοῦ τόπου P.

Jerome^q, however, while he mentions the same traditions which are here alluded to by Epiphanius*, accounts for the name as *implying* the *locus decollatorium*, like the Gemoniæ at Rome, the Ceadas at Sparta, or the Barathrum at Athens^{qa}; the common Tyburn, or place of execution: and from the frequency of such executions †, and the abundance of the mouldering or bleaching remains of bodies, which had probably undergone there the punishment of crucifixion, called in the

* The tradition in question is most distinctly stated by Basil, Operum i. 937. A: in Isaia v.

Λόγος δὲ τίς ἐστι καὶ τοιόσδε, κατὰ τὴν ἀγραφον γνώμην ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ διασφύζομενος· ὡς ἄρα πρώτη ἡ Ἰουδαία ἄνθρωπον ἔσχεν οἰκήτορα τὸν Ἀδὰμ, μετὰ τὸ ἐκβληθῆναι τοῦ παραδείσου ἐν ταύτῃ καθιδρυθέντα, εἰς παραμυθίαν ὧν ἐστερήθη. πρώτη οὖν καὶ νεκρὸν ἐδέξατο ἄνθρωπον, ἐκεῖ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ τὴν καταδίκην πληρώσαντος. καινὸν οὖν ἐδόκει εἶναι τοῖς τότε θέαμα, ὁστέον κεφαλῆς, τῆς σαρκὸς περιβρῦσεως, καὶ ἀποθέμενοι τὸ κρανίον ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, κρανίου τόπον ὠνόμασαν. εἰκὸς δὲ μηδὲ τὸν Νῶε τοῦ ἀρχηγοῦ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀγοῇσαι τὸν τάφον, ὡς μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ διαδοθῆναι τὴν φήμην. διόπερ ὁ Κύριος, τὰς ἀρχὰς τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου θανάτου ἐρευνήσας, εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον κρανίου τόπον τὸ πάθος ἐδέξατο, ἵνα

ἐν ᾧ τόπῳ ἡ φθορὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβεν, ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ζωὴ τῆς βασιλείας ἄρξῃται. κ', τ. λ. Cf. Ambrose, i. 1528. E. In Lucam, lib. x. §. 114: Ipse autem crucis locus, vel in medio, ut conspicuus omnibus: vel supra Adæ, ut Hebræi disputant, sepulcrum. congruebat quippe ut ibi vitæ nostræ primitiæ locarentur, ubi fuerant mortis exordia. And again, ii. 1070. E. F. Epistola lxxi. §. 10: Ibi Adæ sepulcrum; ut illum mortuum in sua cruce resuscitaret. ubi ergo in Adam mors omnium, ibi in Christo omnium resurrectio.

† On one occasion, about thirty-two years before this time, Varus, the governor of Syria, had crucified 2000 of the Jews at once, probably on this very spot. Vide Dissertation v. vol. i. 278.

p Compare also Maimonides, De Ædificio Templi, ii. 2. q Operum iv. Pars i^a. 137. *ad calcem*. In Matt. xxvii. Cf. however, Ibid. Pars ii^a. 547. *ad calcem*. Epistola xlv. Cf. also, Origen, iii. 920. C. In Matt. Commentariorum Series, 126. Theophylact, Operum i. 158. A. In Matt. xxvii: 257. E. In Marc. xv: 485. E. In Lucam xxiii: 750. E. In Joh. xix. qq Suidas, Βάραθρον, Καϊδάς, and Κεδάς.

popular language the place of skulls. According to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it was necessary that Christ should suffer ἐξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς^r—and, therefore, *without* the gate: and Calvary would answer to the former description by answering to the latter; for Maimonides informs us^s that the space included by the walls of Jerusalem was supposed to answer to the παρεμβολή, or the castra Israelitarum; and the space beyond them, to without the camp.

Here then, while the preparations were making to erect the cross, the offer of the wine mixed with myrrh, which St. Matthew expresses by vinegar and gall, (the former capable of being literally understood, because it may denote the ordinary beverage of the Roman soldiers, who, having to keep watch about the crosses for the rest of the day, must have brought their provisions with them; the latter a general description for something bitter,) may have taken place: Psalm lxix. 21. If this potion was intended to produce a stupefying effect, and so to deaden the sensibility of pain, it might be no uncommon thing under such circumstances; or at least in the present instance the offer of it might be the act of some compassionate by-stander, whether one of the soldiers, or not. To accomplish prophecy, which had specified this circumstance in particular, our Lord, as St. Matthew informs us, *tasted* of it, but, that he might not diminish by artificial means the entire burden of his sufferings, as both St. Matthew and St. Mark apprise us, he would not drink of it.

V. The crucifixion of Jesus, or his attachment to the cross, Psalm xxii. 16—along with that of the two malefactors, Isaiah liii. 12—and while they were nailing him to it, his prayer of intercession for his execu-

^r Ch. xiii. 11. 12. Cf. Exod. xxix. 14. Lev. iv. 12. 21. viii. 17. xvi. 27. Numb. xix. 3. ^s De Ratione Adeundi Templi, iii. 2. De Ratione Sacrificiorum, vii. 4.

tioners, and for the rest of the people present, Isaiah liii. 12. as recorded by St. Luke. The form or manner of suspension upon the cross may be conceived from the following description of it by Justin Martyr: ὁρθιον γὰρ τὸ ἐν ἐστὶ ξύλον, ἀφ' οὗ ἐστὶ τὸ ἀνώτατον μέρος εἰς κέρας ὑπερῆρμένον ὅταν τὸ ἄλλο ξύλον προσαρμωσθῇ, καὶ ἐκατέρωθεν ὡς κέρατα, τῷ ἐνὶ κέρατι παρεζευγμένα, τὰ ἄκρα φαίνηται· καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ πηγνύμενον, ὡς κέρας καὶ αὐτὸ ἐξέχον ἐστίν, ἐφ' ᾧ ἐποχοῦνται οἱ σταυρούμενοι ^t *.

* A cross consisted of one main or principal beam, fixed in the ground, perpendicularly to the horizon. From this, at about the distance of a man's height above the ground, projected a solid piece of wood, at right angles to the upright post; and consequently parallel to the horizon. To this, the feet of the sufferer were nailed, and the weight of the body rested upon it. Towards the top of the vertical beam, there was another piece of wood, which projected on either side of it, in a transverse direction, at the same distance from the last mentioned piece, as a man's shoulders would be from his feet. To this the arms of the sufferer were attached, each at its full stretch, and by nails driven right through the palm. The head of the crucified person, was not made fast; but if it leaned upon any support, it would be against the vertical beam; the top of which projected upwards above it. Our Lord's attachment to the cross, during which he uttered the prayer of intercession, consisted in making his feet fast to the one board, and his arms to the

other: the painful severity of which process it is more easy to conceive than to describe. Yet this was the moment when he uttered the prayer in question. This attachment doubtless took place before the crosses were set up in the ground; and it is so specified accordingly. The head of Jesus was not secured; for it is said, at the time of his expiring, that he *bowed the head* before he gave up the ghost.

Various particulars with respect to the punishment of crucifixion anciently, occur in the *Oneirocritica* of Artemidorus, Liber ii. 58: for instance, that the cross was made of nails and wood; that the person crucified was at a distance from the ground; that he was exposed in that situation naked; that his flesh was left to rot upon the cross, in other words, that he was not ordinarily buried. The position of the sufferer on the cross with the arms stretched, is alluded to, *Ibid.* i. 78: κακοῦργος δὲ ὢν σταυρωθήσεται, διὰ τὸ ὕψος καὶ τὴν τῶν χειρῶν ἔκτασιν. Cf. iv. 51. The ordinary height of a cross from the ground, as neither very high nor very low,

^t *Dialogus*, 337. l. 15—21.

To this part above the head the title, declaring the crime for which he was supposed to suffer, (such also being the Roman usage) would be attached ; and of the several forms of the inscription each of the Evangelists records one—St. Matthew, as was to be expected, the native Hebrew or Aramaic ; St. Mark, with equal propriety, the Latin ; and St. Luke, as consistently, the Greek. It is observable, however, that none of them notices the fact of the inscription in the same place, except St. Matthew and St. Mark : St. John's reason for mentioning it will appear presently ; and St. Luke's is manifestly its connection with the history of the two thieves, and with their different conduct towards our Lord on the cross, respectively. The same inscription, setting him forth as the King of the Jews, that is, as the Christ, produced the railing address of the one, and the expression of the faith of the other. On this account St. Luke mentions it where he does ; and but for this, it is probable that he would not have alluded to it at all.

The title in question must have been prepared before the procession set out, and brought by the soldiers with them. St. John's narrative implies that it was brought to the spot attached to the cross ; and such, indeed, was the Roman custom ; that as the person

is illustrated in the following allusion of the same author ; ii. 73 : πολλάκις δὲ καὶ διὰ σταυροῦ πετέσθαι, μήτε δὲ πολὺ τῆς γῆς ἀπέχοντα, μήτε αὖ ταπεινὸν σφόδρα.

As to the position of the several crosses—St. John tells us merely that the malefactors were upon either hand, and Jesus in the midst. From what is said, however, of the breaking of the legs of the two former, *before* the soldiers came to Jesus, I should

conjecture that the crosses of the two thieves both looked to the west, and that of Jesus over against, and between them, to the east. Such a position, too, is best adapted to account for what passed between them ; and for the fact that the inscription on the cross of our Lord was legible *from* the city ; in which case the cross must have fronted the city.

condemned to be crucified carried his own cross, so did the cross bear the declaration of his crime ^u. Among the martyrs of Vienna ^v, Attalus was led about the amphitheatre, preceded by a board with the inscription in Latin, This is Attalus the Christian. It is probable, then, that Pilate was getting the title ready while the soldiers and the rest of the band were employed in the mockery of Jesus. As to the conversation between himself and the authorities of the Jews respecting the change of its terms, that might not take place until after it had been set up and some time exposed to the public view ; or, what is perhaps more probable, it was prior even to the arrival at Calvary.

VI. Directly after, and probably before the arrival of the third hour, because not likely to be later than the attachment of Christ to the cross, if it was not rather going on at the same time with that, the division of the outer garment of Jesus, who had been divested of his clothing before his crucifixion, into four parts, one for each of the soldiers ; and the casting of lots for his inner vesture : Psalm xxii. 18. Upon this point St. Chrysostom observes ^w, ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ δύο ῥάκη συμβάλλοντες οὕτως ὑφαίνουσι τὰ ἱμάτια, δηλῶν ὁ Ἰωάννης ὅτι τοιοῦτος ἦν ὁ χιτωνίσκος, φησὶν, ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν ὑφαντός.

VII. After this, the sitting down to guard the bodies of those upon the crosses, that they might not be taken down before their death : with which event we may date the arrival of the third hour of the day. For St. Mark is express that it was at this hour that Jesus was crucified ; and if the procession had left the Prætorium soon after the second hour of the day, (which is manifestly possible,) then Calvary being

^u Suetonius, Caius, 32. Domitian, 10. Dio, liv. 3. ^v Eusebius, H. E. v. 1. 162. B. ^w Operum viii. 505. C. D. in Johann. Homilia 85. 2. Cf. Theophylact, i. 752. D. in Joh. xix.

near to the city, and probably not three quarters of a Roman mile from the Prætorium itself, though we made every allowance for the slowness of the procession, and for the proceedings by the way; still the crosses might all be set up with the sufferers attached to them, before the third hour was actually come.

The circumstances belonging to the second period are only the following in general.

I. The remarks of the multitude present, as specified by St. Luke: the various contumelies heaped upon Jesus, still hanging alive from the cross, partly by the passers by, according to St. Matthew and St. Mark—partly by the members of the Sanhedrim, according to the first three Evangelists, in whose words, as reported by St. Matthew, there is an unintentional coincidence with Psalm xxii. 8—partly by the soldiers who were keeping watch over him, coming to him, according to St. Luke, and offering him their *posca* to drink; (a circumstance which implies the arrival of their usual dinner hour, the fifth hour of the day;) with an allusion to the inscription on the cross—and partly by one of the malefactors, crucified along with him; which last circumstance St. Matthew and St. Mark express in general terms; but St. Luke, with a stricter attention to historical precision, distinctly attributes to the right person; specifying the rebuke which he received from his comrade, as well as what subsequently passed between this penitent and believing thief and our Lord himself. The sixth hour, or noon, was now at hand; that is, the preceding transactions had extended through almost the space of *three* hours, when I suppose,

II. The affecting incident, related solely by St. John, and regarding our Lord's commendation of his mother to his care, (both having hitherto been present, whe-

ther they both continued to be so still or not,) may most fitly be considered to have taken place *. The next fact, recorded in *his* Gospel, was one which a comparison with the rest proves to have followed the ninth hour, though but by a little; and the preternatural darkness, interposed between the sixth hour and the ninth, may justly be regarded as incompatible with the occurrence of such a transaction after the *former* hour, but *before* the latter; or while that darkness was still in being.

The only circumstance specified during the third period is the darkness in question—resolvable into no physical cause of known operation; for the moon was not yet at the full, though considerably past the change; commencing according to St. Luke, a little before or a little after the sixth hour, at the time when, on the Passover day, the evening sacrifice would begin to be got ready in the temple: and the effect of which was to obscure the sun, which before must have been shining brightly, and to cover the face of the land until the ninth hour; when all the three Evangelists make it to cease.

The circumstances belonging to the fourth period were these: I. With the time of the arrival of the ninth hour, and the dispersion of the darkness, when the offering of the Paschal sacrifices was ready to begin, Jesus uttered the first verse of the twenty-second Psalm, as recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark.

* I think it probable that St. John immediately conducted the mother of our Lord home, as soon as she had been commended to him; and that this is the reason why the name of the Virgin is not specified among those of the other women who

were present at our Lord's expiration, and when he was taken down from the cross, and committed to the grave: though it appears that she was actually present at the crucifixion, as well as they.

II. After this, and with no sensible delay, he exclaimed, according to St. John, I thirst.

III. In consequence of this exclamation, the sponge filled with vinegar, that is, with the *posca* of the soldiers present, was placed upon a wand or stick of hyssop wood, the only method of bringing it into contact with his mouth, and so offered to him*. This fact, by which the twenty-first verse of the sixty-ninth Psalm was fulfilled, related succinctly by St. Matthew and by St. Mark, is given in detail by St. John†.

IV. When this was over, which would be a little after the ninth hour, Jesus, knowing that whatever had been predicted respecting his sufferings before his death had now been accomplished, exclaimed, according to St. John, *τετέλεσται*: and then, that the accomplishment of those things which had been predicted to happen after his death might next begin, uttering a loud voice, according to St. Matthew and St. Mark—and repeating the prayer also, Into thine hand I commit my spirit, (Psalm xxxi. 5.) according to St. Luke—and simply bowing the head, to denote the instant extinction of life, according to St. John—all which circumstances might follow upon each other in this order—gave up the ghost, as all the accounts are agreed, last of all.

It must be evident, therefore, that in this separation

* Plutarch, Cato Major, 1: πλὴν εἴ ποτε διψήσας περιφλεγῶς ὄξος ᾔτησεν—that is, some of this *posca*.

Apollonius, De Mirabilibus, 174: τὸ καλούμενον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ ... τοὺς βουλομένους αὐτοῦ ὑδρεύεσθαι, σπόγγοις πρὸς ξύλοις δεδεμένοις λαμβάνειν.

† It appears from this fact that the prediction, “they gave me vinegar to drink,” was either not fulfilled at all, or only in part, by what happened previously to the like effect—only so much of it as specified the further circumstance, “they gave me gall to eat.”

of his soul from his body our Lord did not wait for the natural progress of dissolution, but exerted his Divine power, in anticipation of the effect : the reason of which was the necessity of so timing his death, that in all the circumstances, which took place afterwards, the Scriptures might be fulfilled, as they had been fulfilled before ; that he might be taken down from the cross and committed to the grave before sunset—without which, and if he was to rise again on the Sunday, he could not, even according to the Jewish computation of time, have been previously three days and three nights in the earth ; that, when the soldiers came to accelerate the deaths of the parties crucified, they might find *him* dead already, and so offer no violence to his body, but what instead of infringing, was rather the fulfilment of prophecy^x : A bone of him shall not be broken—and, They shall look upon *me* whom they have pierced^y. Such is the observation of Origen upon the timeliness of his death^z : καὶ τάχα διὰ τοῦτο προλαβὼν ἐξελήλυθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος, ἵνα αὐτὸ τηρήσῃ, καὶ μὴ καταχθῇ τὰ σκέλη, ὡς τὰ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ σταυρωθέντων ληστῶν *. Crucifixion though a painful was still a lingering death ; to which assertion the facts referred to in the margin will supply cases in point †^a.

* Cf. Eusebius, Demonstratio Evangel. iii. vi. 108. D: Cyprian, De Idolorum Vanitate, 16 : Lactantius, Divin. Institt. iv. 26. 394 : Theophylact, i. 160. C. in Matt. xxvii.

† Carcere dicuntur clausi sperare salutem : | Atque aliquis pendens in cruce vocat. Ovid, De Ponto, i. vi. 37.

Artemidorus, Oneirocritica, iv. 35 : Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ φιλόσοφος ἔδοξε τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ κατακεκρίσθαι καὶ παραιτησάμενος, μόλις ἀποελύσθαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ σταυροῦ. True, this is meant of a dream ; but it is a dream supposed to be a representation of what might have happened.

Justin, xxii. 7 : Adeo ut de

^x Cf. Exod. xii. 46. Ps. xxxiv. 20. Celsum, ii. 16. Operum i. 403. B.

^y Zech. xii. 10.

^z Contra

^a Vita Josephi, 75. Herodotus, Polymnia, 194. Suetonius, Galba, 9.

V. Simultaneously with the expiration of Christ, the vail of the tabernacle, according to the first three Evangelists, is rent in twain, (so simultaneously, that it might be mentioned, as it is by St. Luke, even before the mention of the expiration itself,) the earthquake ensues—the rocks are rent—the graves are opened—and the bodies of many holy men are resuscitated *—though their entering into Jerusalem, and appearing alive unto many, do not take place until after the resurrection of our Lord himself, who was the proper *first-fruits* of such as slept: *all* which circumstances, though they may be implicitly alluded to in St. Luke, are specified distinctly by St. Matthew only: the confession of the centurion, in relating which both the others agree with St. Luke, is extorted from him—and the people who had come to the spectacle return, according to St. Luke, with minds changed, and beating their breasts, as under the consciousness of some great sin.

summa cruce, veluti de tribunali, in Pœnorum scelera concionaretur. Photius, Codex 94: Iamblichus Dramaticum, 74. line 12: in this novel, the hero of the story is attached to the cross, yet taken down alive again. Quoniam ergo majorem sustinent cruciatum, qui non percutiuntur post fixationem, sed vivunt cum plurimo cruciatu, aliquando autem et tota nocte, et adhuc post eam, tota die &c.: Origen, iii. 928. C: Comm. in Matt. Series, 140—Miraculum enim erat, quoniam post tres horas receptus est, qui forte biduum victurus erat in cruce, secundum consuetudinem eorum, qui suspenduntur quidem, non autem percutiuntur: Ibid. D. Anthologia, iii.

51. Lucilii cvii: μακροτέρῳ σταυρῷ σταυρούμενον ἄλλον ἑαυτοῦ | ὁ φθονερός Διοφῶν ἐγγὺς ἰδὼν ἐτάκη.

* Perhaps this opening of the graves, and resuscitation of the bodies which slept, being mentioned by St. Matthew alone, are to be reckoned among the number of his anticipations, and are introduced here solely from their connexion with the death and resurrection of our Saviour; and more particularly because of the similarity of the circumstances, under which both the death and the resurrection took place. There was an earthquake at the time of this last event, as well as that of the former, and accompanied with similar effects.

VI. The chief priests or the Sanhedrim, ignorant perhaps as yet of the death of Jesus, (though that is by no means a necessary supposition,) and desirous to hasten it, as well as that of the thieves, prevail upon Pilate to order their legs to be broken, that so they might expire and be taken down for interment before the sabbath should arrive. Josephus will shew that, agreeably to the Divine mandate^b, this would have been done, under similar circumstances, before sunset even upon a common day; and much more before sunset on the eve of an *high day**. The soldiers were sent accordingly, and broke the legs of the thieves; but finding that Jesus was already dead, one of them, doubtless from a wanton impulse, pierced his side only; which act was followed by a discharge of blood and water, too great and too extraordinary to be accounted for upon any natural principle; and therefore strictly miraculous. For these particulars we are indebted solely to St. John, who was consequently still an eye-witness of all which passed †.

VII. About the same time, but after the soldiers had been sent on their errand, and before the death of the thieves, accelerated as it was by this additional

* Yet it is probable that this particular usage of the Jewish law was not always respected by the Romans, in the infliction of their punishment of crucifixion; and that in order to its being enforced in the present instance, a special application to Pilate would be necessary, on the part of the persons of the greatest weight and influence among the Jews at the time. Generally speaking, it was part of the punishment of crucifixion that the

body should be left exposed to rot on the cross. See Artemidorus, *Oneirocritica*, ii. 51. Also iv. 51: διὰ τὸ πολλοὺς τρέφειν οἰωνούς. Hence Horace, *Non pascas in cruce corvos*. *Epistolarum* i. xvi. 48.

† St. John might have returned to the spot, so as to be present at the remainder of these transactions, as soon as the miraculous darkness was over, whether the Virgin did so or not.

^b Bell. Jud. iv. 5. 2. Dent. xxi. 22, 23.

violence, Joseph of Arimathæa, the rich man with whom the Messiah was to make his grave in his death ^c, intercedes with Pilate for leave to remove the body of Jesus; and Pilate, having first ascertained from the centurion the fact of his death however unusually sudden, gives him leave. Then, in conjunction with Nicodemus, who had provided grave-clothes * and spices, according to the custom of the Jews, more especially in the funeral solemnities of persons of consequence, he takes down the body from the cross, and hastily wrapping it up in the linen clothes along with the spices, because the Parasceue was begun, and the sabbath was fast approaching, as hastily commits it to the nearest grave, which was his own, and in a garden of his own; where certain of our Lord's female disciples, who had come up with him from Galilee, and had hitherto been about his cross, also saw it deposited. These particulars are more or less fully recorded by each of the Evangelists; and as I shall have occasion to refer to them again hereafter, I touch upon them only summarily at present. The time which they would take up may be defined in general as comprehended between the ninth hour of the day and sunset—after the one but before the other—and perhaps equidistant from both. And here the events of the fourth division, and with that of the fourteenth of

* Artemidorus, *Oneirocritica*, i. 14. observes, ἐπεὶ καὶ οἱ ἀποθνήσκοντες ἐσχισμένοις ἐνειλοῦνται ῥάκεσιν, ὥς καὶ τὰ βρέφη, καὶ χαμαὶ τίθενται: whence it appears that the custom of wrapping the bodies of the dead in grave-clothes, ὁθόνια or ἐντάφια, was common in his time both to the Jews and

the Gentiles. The same writer informs us, *Oneirocritica*, ii. 3. that the clothes so used for that purpose, and in which the bodies of the dead were carried to be buried, were alway λευκά, or white; as those in which the living mourned for them were always black.

^c Isaiah liii. 9.

Nisan, would properly expire. I shall still prolong this Dissertation, however, so far as to consider the next period in the Gospel history; which will extend from sunset on the fourteenth to sunset on the fifteenth of the same month, throughout the whole of the Jewish sabbath; and from thence to the morning of the sixteenth, when our Saviour rose again from the dead.

It contains only one fact, concerning which there can be little difficulty; insomuch as it is recorded by St. Matthew alone, xxvii. 62—the end: following undoubtedly after the burial, but preceding the resurrection, of Christ, and by him expressly assigned to the *ἐπαύριον*, the day after the Preparation; that is, to the sabbath; the fifteenth of Nisan itself. This fact was the application of the Sanhedrim to Pilate for permission to set a guard over the door of the sepulchre; and the appointment of that guard accordingly. The times of those two incidents might possibly be different: the application might be made in the course of the sabbath, or just when the sabbath was about to expire—but the setting of the guard we may conclude for various reasons could not be until after that.

First, because it is not probable that the Sanhedrim themselves would take such a step during the continuance of the sabbath; for that would have been to break the sabbath. Secondly, in the day-time *on* the the sabbath, and for so public a place as Calvary, there would be no occasion to set a guard over the grave at all. Thirdly, they had not applied for the same permission, nor therefore thought it necessary to appoint such a guard, on the *eve* of the sabbath; they must, consequently, have supposed that the grave would be sufficiently protected, during the sabbath, by the sanctity of the sabbath itself. Fourthly, the proposed end of setting a guard would be answered by stationing it

at the sepulchre on the eve of the first day of the week: for the night of that eve was the first and the only time when any attempt at the removal of the body of Christ by his disciples, for such a purpose as they supposed, could be expected to take place. Fifthly, the design of the measure being expressly to defeat any clandestine attempt on the part of the followers of our Lord, it was natural that the step should be taken with as much secrecy as possible, especially with respect to them: and it is certain that the women, who visited the sepulchre on the morning of the resurrection, were ignorant at the time of the existence of the watch about it: but this could scarcely have been the case, had the guard been posted at an earlier period than the night preceding. And this point being thus established, we may proceed to consider the accounts of the resurrection.

DISSERTATION XLIII.

On the Harmony of the accounts of the Resurrection.

THE Harmony of the accounts of the Resurrection, if we include under the term not merely the principal fact, but also the several personal manifestations of Jesus Christ to his disciples, by which it was subsequently confirmed, comprises a period of forty days; viz. between the resurrection and the ascension. The difficulties, however, which belong to this part of our subject, concern almost exclusively the particulars of a single day, the day of the resurrection itself; the sixteenth of Nisan with the Jews, the seventh of the Julian April and Easter-day with us.

The events of this day admit of no other distinct classification, except into the several visits to the tomb and the several manifestations of Christ, which took place upon it; the appearances of the angels, as part of the circumstances belonging to the history of the visits, being consequently included under that: and among these events the testimony of *all* the Evangelists establishes the following relation at least—that the *first* manifestation, recorded by any, was posterior to the *last* visit, recorded by any. The question concerning the visits, therefore, will properly require to be considered before that which concerns the manifestations.

Now with regard to these visits, each of the Evangelists records one—and two of them, St. Luke and St. John, record two; the second, however, in each of these instances, so connected with the first, that it arose, and is described to have arisen, out of the report of those who had made the first. The principal diffi-

culty, therefore, still concerns the first; and if that can be satisfactorily adjusted, every other, which concerns merely the second, may be easily accounted for.

If then we compare the several narratives with respect to these in particular; there is so much circumstantial agreement between the *one* visit recorded by St. Matthew, and the *one* visit recorded by St. Mark, as to leave no doubt that they must be in the main the same: and again, if we compare the account of this *one* visit, in either of them, with the account of the first visit in St. John; as Mary of Magdala was certainly a party in all the three, all the three must so far have been the same. But if we compare the same account with the history of the first visit in St. Luke, there is no longer any such appearance of agreement between them as would authorize us to pronounce them the same; but on the contrary, so many symptoms of disagreement as render it much more probable that they were distinct. This will be seen more clearly by the help of the following considerations.

Each of these three Evangelists concurs in ascribing the visit to the Holy sepulchre to certain of our Lord's female disciples; and each concurs in ascribing the motive of the visit to the natural and pious desire of completing his funeral obsequies; which the exigency of the time had prevented from being completed on the evening of the crucifixion. With a prospective view both to the motive, and also to the fact, of such a visit, they all, among other particulars connected with the account of our Lord's last moments, specify the presence of certain of these his disciples about his cross, first at his expiration, and subsequently when he was taken down to be buried. And this view appears so much the more distinctly, because, in mentioning these women by name, they particularize at that time

none but those, whom they represent afterwards as joining in the visits to the tomb.

Now our Lord's expiration, as we saw, took place about the ninth hour, or three in the afternoon; when the Parasceue had begun, and the arrival of the sabbath was scarcely three hours distant. The nature of the Parasceue was such as to partake in some respect of the sanctity of the sabbath, or to be an anticipation of the sabbath itself. The testimony of Josephus, it is true, which demonstrated this of it in general, restricted it's sanctity in particular to an immunity from civil business; and, if our Lord was actually alive at the ninth hour, it is evident that neither his body, nor the bodies of the thieves, who did not expire until some time later, could be taken down for interment except during the Parasceue itself. The sanctity of the period, therefore, must be limited to such immunities as Josephus mentioned, and certainly was not so great as to interfere with a business of this kind: or though it had been, still it must have been dispensed with in the present instance, out of deference to the special reasons of the case.

Yet this very necessity would be an additional motive why the ceremony of our Lord's interment should be performed with all possible dispatch. It was the urgency of the time which determined the choice of his sepulchre. In the place where Jesus was crucified there was a garden—and in the garden a sepulchre—there, then, they laid the body of Jesus, because of the Preparation of the Jews; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand. The body of Christ was deposited in that garden and in that grave, not merely because they belonged to Joseph, but because they were the nearest that could be found, and there was no time to take it elsewhere; the sabbath would have arrived in the midst of

the attempt. The funeral ceremonies of the Jews, duly completed, would have taken up a considerable time; and the period of the Parasceue itself, which was all that remained for this purpose, had been prematurely abbreviated by the circumstances which preceded the removal of the body from the cross—the application to Pilate—the examination of the centurion—and the other particulars on record: which must needs have occupied time, where there was little or none to be spared.

It is clear, then, that our Lord's interment was hasty; and, consequently, that his funeral solemnities were very inadequately performed. He had predicted, only six days before, that the unction of his body by Mary, the sister of Lazarus, would be the sole embalmment which it should receive for the grave. The mixture brought by Nicodemus had perhaps not been duly prepared; and was certainly not duly applied; for it was not the customary method of embalming a body at this period, when liquid perfumes were so generally used, merely to wrap up aromata or spices along with it in grave-clothes *. Besides which,

* Mr. Harmer, (vol. ii. 156. ch. vi. Obs. lx.) is of opinion, in opposition to Dr. Ward, that the Jewish method of embalming dead bodies, resembled the Egyptian both in other respects, and in the circumstance of *disembowelling*, previous to interment. There is no doubt that the due performance of this last part of the process, if it really was wont to take place, would add considerably to the length of the whole. I think, however, that in this opinion Mr. Harmer is mistaken.

No Jew, it may be presumed,

would have ventured to open a dead body, or to take out any part of it. The Egyptians, Palmyrenes, and others, might disembowel, as Mr. H. contends; but what they did, is no argument of what the Jews would do in the like case.

As the object of embalmment in general, and of the disembowelling part in particular, was to obviate the process of natural decay; Martha would not have said of a body embalmed and disembowelled, on the fourth day after the death, ἥδη ὄξει: John xi. 39. Nor could it be

Nicodemus, as hitherto a *concealed* disciple of Jesus Christ, compared with his regular followers, especially with those who had always ministered to him of their substance before, might be regarded as a kind of stranger. The duty of embalming the dead body of Christ belonged rather to such as had ministered to its wants while alive.

But even the piety of these disciples themselves under the circumstances of the case, in the absence of the necessary preparations, and in the momentary expectation of the sabbath, would have no other alternative, except to defer the last honours to his memory until the first convenient opportunity—which could not be earlier than the beginning of the first day of the week. At that time, however, both the sense of duty and the fervour of attachment would urge them to the speedy resumption of offices, which the emergency of the occasion had compelled them to suspend until then; and the dead body having been, as it was, a day and two nights in the grave, the necessity of the case itself would dictate the expediency of no further delay.

considered an extraordinary thing that the body of our Lord, so embalmed and disembowelled, in three days and three nights should not have been long enough in the grave to see corruption.

The custom of the Jews from the remotest antiquity appears to have been to bury their dead with, or in, sweet spices: but there is not the least allusion in the Old Testament to the further accompaniment of disembowelling.

A pious mind revolts at the idea of the body of our Lord being subjected to any such treatment: nor does it soften

its repugnance to the idea of such treatment, that it was only intended, and not executed, in his instance.

The practice of the Romans at this time, a practice very likely to be common throughout their dominions, if they did not themselves borrow it from the East, was only to anoint the bodies of their dead with liquid perfumes, and to burn odours of various kinds along with them: though it is true that the Romans, generally speaking, burnt the same bodies on funeral piles; which the Jews did not.

That they had conceived the design of revisiting the tomb, and completing the process of the embalment, so early as the eve of the sabbath, though they might defer its execution until the morning after the sabbath; appears not only from the mention of their being present at the interment of our Lord in general, but more especially from the stress which is laid on their *observing* or *taking notice* of the tomb, and *how* the body was deposited in it. This would not be so distinctly specified, except to prepare us for their subsequent visit.

The sabbath did not expire until sunset on Saturday in Passion-week: and some of the number, having waited too long in the garden (which is an argument of the lateness of the burial) the day before, had even then their spices to procure. The process of embalment itself would have taken up time; and had it been attempted on the night of the sabbath, it must have been performed in the dark. The watch too, which had been planted at the grave either in the course of the morning, or directly after the arrival of the evening, of Saturday, until it was disturbed by the apparition of the angel, would have effectually prevented any access to the sepulchre; and the Providence of God, in order to the fulfilment of prophecy, which required that the body of Christ should continue untouched in the grave three days and nights, would doubtless take care that none, whether friend or enemy, should prematurely interfere with its repose. And this was one natural consequence of our Lord's dying upon the Friday. Had not that been the case, the visit of the women, though with the most pious intention, would probably have been made on the following morning, and not upon the morning but one after.

We need not be surprised, therefore, that our Lord's

female disciples, though they might have formed the design of embalming his body as early as the evening of Friday, should yet not be able to execute their purpose before the morning of the Sunday at the earliest. Of the setting of the guard meanwhile, and of the sealing up the entrance of the sepulchre, (which, though they did not interfere with the conception, would necessarily have prevented the accomplishment, of their purpose,) if they took place at the time we have conjectured, they could not be aware beforehand; and it would seem they were still in ignorance even on the morning of their visit.

Now, upon the assumption of a design like this, conceived by the women, who attended our Lord's last moments on the evening of Friday, but not executed, nor capable of being executed, before an early hour on the morning of Sunday, the harmony of the course of events upon that morning, relating to the visits to the tomb, must be constructed.

For first, the number of these women was considerable; and indeed the resort of females to the several feasts, especially to the Passover and the Scenopegia, though voluntary on their part, was almost as great as that of the men. Besides those who are mentioned by name, many others are alluded to in general terms, as they who had attended upon and ministered to our Lord in Galilee, and had come up with him on this occasion to Jerusalem. All these, or most of them, must have concurred in forming the resolution in question.

Secondly, these women, as believers in Jesus and followers of Jesus in common, either would be known to each other, or would not. If they were not known to each other, though they might all have concurred in forming the same design, it cannot be supposed that they would all act in concert to execute it. Hence,

though all might have gone to the tomb, and all have finally been assembled at the tomb on the morning in question, they might set out at different times, and would set out in different parties; and consequently they might arrive at different times, as they would in different parties. But if they were known to each other, though they might have agreed to act in concert to execute, as well as concurred in conceiving, the design of their visit, still if some lodged apart from the rest, or they belonged to different Paschal companies, their agreement would extend no further than an appointment to meet at the tomb by a certain hour on the morning specified: in which case, some might be earlier in arriving than others; though, if nothing had occurred to prevent their waiting for the rest, all might have met there at last.

Thirdly, there are only *two* parties of women of which any evidence is found in the Gospel accounts; one of which we may call the party of Salome, and the other the party of Johanna. The former is the party in St. Matthew or in St. Mark; the latter is the party in St. Luke: for though St. Matthew and St. Mark mention others in common with St. Luke, and St. Luke mentions others in common with St. Matthew and St. Mark, *they* only mention Salome, and *he* only mentions Johanna. These two parties were distinct—and either, as consisting of persons unknown to each other, acted entirely independently throughout, or, if they consisted of persons known to each other, they set out at different times and from different places; and so arrived at the sepulchre at different times. This conclusion we may confirm as follows:

I. It is a kind of presumptive argument in its favour, that the party of Salome appears to have consisted, and is certainly specified as consisting, of three

individuals only; Salome, Mary of Magdala, and Mary the mother of James and Joses: the party of Johanna is not specified by name; but in general terms, and under the description above given, it is said to have included *many*; which I think must mean more than *three*. Among these, if we compare Luke viii. 2, 3, Susanna would probably be one.

II. It is a similar presumptive argument, that Salome and the second Mary; the former a person of some consequence and the mother of *two* of the Apostles, the latter a near relation of the Virgin's, the mother also of *one* Apostle and the wife of Cleopas; would probably lodge not with the rest of the disciples, but with the Eleven; who seem, like our Saviour, to have lodged somewhere by themselves.

III. According to St. Luke, the party of Johanna got *their* spices ready on the day of the Preparation, as soon as they returned from the garden, *after* the burial but *before* the sabbath: and rested, as he expresses it, subsequently during the sabbath, according to the commandment: whereas it is expressly affirmed by St. Mark, xvi. 1, that the party of Salome did not get *their's* ready until *after* the sabbath; that is, until a night and a day later: διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου.....ἡγόρασαν ἀρώματα, ἵνα ἐλθούσαι ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν. This must be sufficient to prove that the two parties were so far distinct, and acted independently of each other. There would be time enough, even after sunset on the sabbath, both to purchase and to prepare what would not be wanted for use before the next morning. But had not this party been a different one from the other, and detained longer than that in the garden on the evening of Friday, they too, we may reasonably infer, would have bought and prepared their spices before the sabbath. This very circumstance of a sepa-

rate provision of such articles in each case suggests the same distinction. Had the parties been one and the same, a single provision would have sufficed for both. It is not clear, indeed, whether the party of Johanna had not *their* spices procured before the interment of the body: there is no assertion that they were *bought*, but only that they were *prepared*, before the sabbath; and *this* would be a distinct thing from *that*. The spices, even after they had been provided, would still require a certain mixture and preparation, the most important part of the process, before they could be ready for use. The party of Salome, however, had not merely to prepare, but also to purchase *their* spices before the sabbath.

If these considerations, then, should render it probable *a priori* that the parties in question were distinct, and consequently, though they might act in concert with respect to the common end in view, yet might set out at different junctures of time, or from different places, and consequently arrive at the tomb in a different order of succession; the argument *a posteriori*, or the comparison of particulars, as recorded to have transpired upon the actual arrival of each, will confirm this conclusion; and place it beyond a question that the visit of the one party was a distinct thing from the visit of the other.

I. If we contrast the account of the visit in St. Matthew with the relation of the visit in St. Luke; when the women arrived at the tomb, according to the former, they found the stone removed from the entrance—an angel sitting upon it—and the watch still present about the sepulchre—but in a state of great alarm and consternation; according to the latter, they found the stone removed indeed, but no one visible either in or about the tomb—and the entrance in particular entirely

unoccupied and free. If the visits were one and the same, these different accounts would not be consistent : but if the visits themselves were distinct, each of them may be true. The first party of the women being gone, the stone would continue removed from the entrance as before ; but the angel might cease to be visible : and the watch also might be departed to make their report of what had happened.

Besides which, the visit in St. Matthew was preceded by a great earthquake ; which accompanied the descent of the angel : a particular altogether so remarkable, that had it formed one of the circumstances connected with the visit in St. Luke, we can scarcely suppose that he would have omitted it. For the descent of the angel was preliminary to the rolling away of the stone ; without which there could have been no access to the sepulchre. Nor can it be objected here that St. Mark also omits the same circumstance : for St. Mark's account, as I shall shew by and by, is critically supplementary of St. Matthew's.

Again, according to St. Matthew's account, it does not distinctly appear that the parties even entered the tomb : every thing which *he* relates seems to have taken place outside of the tomb : but according to St. Luke's, the party must have entered the tomb ; and whatsoever *he* records to have happened unto them, must have happened within the tomb.

II. If we compare St. Mark's account with St. Luke's ; according to the former, upon entering the tomb, and before they had time to examine whether the body was still to be seen or not, the women perceived an angel, in a sitting posture and on their right : according to St. Luke, upon entering the tomb they saw no one present ; and before the appearance of any angel they had time to examine and to discover that the body was

missing ; and to feel all the effects of the surprise and the perplexity produced by the discovery : and after this, when the angels appeared to them, they appeared *both together, or at once* ; and not in a *sitting*, but in a *standing* position. These circumstances also cannot be consistent as parts of the same account, but may be very compatible with each other if they belonged to distinct occasions.

III. If we compare St. Matthew and St. Mark in conjunction with St. Luke, then, though there had been no other appearance of discrepancy between them, yet the language ascribed to the angels respectively in each is so different, as to prove that the visions themselves, and the occasions out of which they arose, must have been distinct. There is so much disparity both in the particular expressions and in the general drift and purport of the two addresses, that to suppose them the same would be utterly incongruous and inexplicable. But if they were delivered at different times, and on distinct occasions, then either may be shewn to be so consistent with the special circumstances of its own occasion, that this very consistency shall be one of the strongest arguments to prove the reality of each ; and yet its entire independence upon the other. For first, to admit for argument's sake the difference of the two occasions ; since one of the visits in that case must have preceded the other, we may take it for granted that if it was either, it was the visit in St. Matthew or in St. Mark, not the visit in St. Luke. The earthquake and the descent of the angel, before which the stone was not removed from the entrance, preceded that visit ; and from the place which they occupy in the narrative, preceded it but by a little. They might have taken place in the interval between the setting out of the *party* and the time of their arrival at the tomb.

I know it is usual to give the principal verbs, ἐγένετο and ἀπεκύλισεν, a meaning at variance with this conclusion; and making them signify not what took place at the time, but what had taken place some time before. This construction, however, does violence to the proper signification of the indefinite tense; and besides is irreconcilable with the final end of the dispensation itself, combined as it is with the historical circumstances of the context. The mission of the angels must have had for its object one of two purposes, or both—either to minister to the resurrection of our Lord himself—or to facilitate the access of the women to the sepulchre, as the first link necessary to the integrity of the chain of the evidence, by which the fact of the resurrection was about to be confirmed—or, what is equally possible, to do both. On either of these suppositions the descent of the angel would nearly coincide with the time of the setting out of the women; for our Lord rose soon after the dawn of day, and they set out at the dawn of day. Much more, if it was designed for the latter of the abovementioned purposes. To that end two things would be requisite, each of them effected by the presence or the agency of the angels; one to intimidate the guard, the other to remove the stone. The guard would have resisted the admission of the women, though the stone had created no difficulty; and yet the stone by itself was greater than they could remove.

Having accomplished these purposes, the angel sat down on the stone at the entrance of the cave; and was found there, still seated, when the women arrived. The guard, too, must have continued in their original position; being so far overcome by their fear itself as to have lost the power of motion: nor did they recover themselves, or venture to quit their situation, until the

women were departed again, and the angel also had ceased to be visible without the tomb. For it is not said that they repaired to the city and made their report of what had happened, until the women were on their return with the message sent to the Apostles. These considerations ought to be decisive proofs that, if every visit to the tomb was not the same, the visit recorded by St. Matthew must have been the earliest of any.

Now the appearance of the angel was as likely to intimidate the women as the soldiers; the former being just as unprepared for it as the latter: and such was the effect which it produced at first upon them. The language of the angel, then, is very naturally, and yet very clearly, addressed first of all to their fears: *μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς*—Do not *ye* be afraid: a very distinct intimation that there were *others* present and others *afraid* as well as they; who, considering for what purpose *they* were there, had good reason to be afraid. But not so they—who had come with the pious and praiseworthy intent of doing honour to the crucified body of Jesus.

Having thus shewn them that he was acquainted with their motive in visiting the tomb, he adds, in the next place, (what was clearly to be expected in reference to such a purpose,) that Jesus, whom they sought, was not to be found *there*; for he was risen. Next, in direct confirmation of the truth of this assertion, he appeals to the sensible testimony of the place where his body had been deposited—in which place they themselves had seen it laid; and which was now empty. Lastly, he promises a still clearer proof of its truth, by a personal manifestation of Jesus himself, as soon as they returned into Galilee; whither he should precede *them*, as they had attended *him* from thence. All these particulars are naturally connected together;

agreeable to the circumstances of the case ; and such altogether as might be expected, *a priori*, in an address to the *first* party of our Saviour's friends and disciples, who might visit his tomb on the morning of the resurrection for any such purpose as is specified in the Gospel narrative. Let us examine the circumstances of the similar address in St. Luke.

It must strike every one who compares them together, that as the address in St Matthew is characterized by a tone of encouragement, gentleness, and condescension, so the address in St. Luke is distinguished by a tone of severity and reproof. It begins with an expostulation : Why seek ye the *living*, or *rather* the *living one*, among the *dead* ? and the tone of this expostulation is maintained throughout ; for it proceeds to remind them that when Jesus was still in Galilee, and long before he came to Jerusalem, he had predicted all this ; both his death, and at a certain time after his death answering to the present, his resurrection ; which was virtually to reproach either their dulness of apprehension, or their want of faith ; their dulness, if they had not understood nor remembered his words—their want of faith, if understanding and remembering them both, they had yet come on such an errand as this, which was to expect to find him dead. Nothing so severe as this is to be met with in St. Matthew : nor in fact have the two addresses any thing in common, except merely the particulars interposed between these two members, the repeated assurance that Jesus was not there, but risen : which however is so natural and appropriate, under any circumstances of distinction besides, that it can prove nothing of the identity of the two occasions.

This difference of language and deportment on the part of the angels, would be easily accounted for, if, after

the assurance, received a little while before, the same women, or any part of them, had shortly afterwards returned to the tomb. Now though it is certain, or at least highly probable, that Mary Magdalene in particular could not have been one of the number, it is by no means impossible that the other two, as they were going away, might have fallen in with the party of Johanna, coming to the sepulchre; and having told them what had happened to themselves, instead of persuading them to turn back, might have been induced to go on with them; and in order to satisfy the curiosity which so wonderful a report would naturally excite in their companions, (a report which, when they first heard it, they might not know how to believe,) to come again to the tomb.

I propose this, however, only as one conjecture out of many; for I consider it just as probable that the two parties were originally, and continued all the time, distinct. If, indeed, though really distinct they acted on any preconcerted plan, they might not arrive at once, nor yet, probably, much after each other: especially as all the Evangelists agree that each of the parties, who paid the first visit to the sepulchre, set out at the earliest possible hour in the morning. The transactions at the tomb, with the party of Salome, were not such as to occupy many minutes; so that, however soon a second party might have arrived after them, they might find every thing over, and their predecessors gone away, before their arrival. St. Mark's assertion that the women, on quitting the sepulchre, οὐδενὶ οὐδέν ἐειπὼν, which would seem to imply that they said nothing to any one, would also seem to imply that their companions themselves did not come in their way: for this silence must surely be understood of strangers as such, and not of those who belonged to

their own society. From these latter they would never have concealed the knowledge of what they had seen—especially when they were going with a message to the Apostles themselves: and the reason assigned for their silence, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ—it is manifest would be partly removed by falling in with persons whom they knew.

I think, then, they did not fall in with any such; and still the angels might address a second party, arriving for the same purpose as the first, but under circumstances somewhat distinct, in a manner not quite the same as before. Nor is their language, after all, so severe as to convey more than a grave expostulation, and a mild rebuke. There was this difference in the situation of the parties addressed, which might produce a corresponding difference in the terms of the address; that the first party, having seen the angel before they had any the least evidence of the resurrection, were bereft of their presence of mind from the first; they had neither time nor capacity for summoning their recollection to their aid, and remembering the predictions of Christ: but the second party having entered the tomb without seeing any one, and examined the interior without finding any thing there, had leisure and opportunity to have reasoned, from existing appearances, to the fact of the resurrection of Christ—confirming the conclusion by the recollection of his own assurances—before they were alarmed by the sudden manifestation of the angels: which yet it is evident they did not do; and for this dulness, or this unbelief, they might incur an express rebuke.

The only material objection against the supposition in question is this; that, in recounting the names of those who made a report to the Apostles of what had transpired at the tomb, St. Luke specifies Mary of

Magdala, and Mary the mother of James, as well as Johanna: whence it might be concluded that all were present at the preceding transaction; or that all made the visit in conjunction. Nor would I oppose to this difficulty, what would be only to silence one objection by starting another, how incompatible it must be with the account of St. Matthew or of St. Mark, who make their party to consist of Salome and of the two Maries merely, to include in it Johanna and many others also. It is more to the purpose to observe that the objection will be totally removed, if, as we admitted was not impossible, the party of Salome, after arriving first and visiting the tomb first, as related by St. Matthew and by St. Mark, fell in upon their return with the party of Johanna; and accompanied them to the sepulchre again.

But though this solution of the difficulty should not be embraced, still it may be contended that St. Luke has ended his account of what took place at the tomb, down to the mention of the return of the women, and of the communication of their report to the Apostles, before he specifies the names of any: and when he specifies the names of any, he mentions them only as the names of the parties who made the report; and nothing further: he does not affirm that they were the parties who had visited the tomb, and seen the vision of the angels, as related by himself just before. On the contrary, neither when preparing to record that visit—nor earlier, when alluding to the presence and cooperation of the same parties about the cross and at the burial of Jesus—does he mention the names of any. Considering the singular accuracy of this Evangelist, even in the slightest particulars, we may look upon this silence as not without design; and the reason of it may be that out of this

number, which did not, as I suppose, include either Salome or the two Maries, the only person likely to be known to his readers, because the only one to whom an allusion had occurred in his Gospel before, was Johanna, the wife of Chuzas the procurator of Herod.

If, then, he intended to specify by name those women alone, who concurred in making a like report of what they had seen or heard at the tomb, to others who had not been thither, there may be an *omission* in this part of his narrative—but there is no inconsistency in it, as compared with the accounts of the rest. The women of the *first* party made a report to the Apostles, as well as those of the *second*: the substance of each report was exactly the same; and it might truly be said in reference to both parties, because they had each precisely a similar communication to make, that they related *these* things to the Apostles, and to all the rest. What they related is thus stated by one of the number to whom it was related, Cleopas, in his discourse with our Lord himself: ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκες τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς, γενόμεναι ὄρθριαι ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον· καὶ μὴ εὐροῦσαι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, ἦλθον λέγουσαι καὶ ὀπτασίαν ἀγγέλων ἑωρακεῖναι, οἳ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν. Luke xxiv. 22, 23. It is indifferent to which of the reports this summary of particulars is supposed to refer; for it is a correct description of either.

On the question, however, of the supposed omission generally, the consideration, of which we have already, in so many instances, experienced the benefit, viz. regard and attention to the supplementary character of the later Gospels, will be equally useful to us now. On this principle, the account of St. Matthew must be taken along with that of St. Mark, the account of both with St. Luke's, and the account of all the three with St. John's,

if each is to be duly appreciated by itself. There are omissions in St. Matthew, supplied by St. Mark; there are omissions in both, supplied by St. Luke; there are omissions in all the three, supplied by St. John: and what each has related in particular, and why he has related it, cannot be rightly understood, without knowing also what others had related, and why they had related it, before him. To examine, therefore, each of the accounts respectively; in the course of doing which we shall find an opportunity of introducing and discussing the question respecting the personal manifestations of Christ, as well as despatch what remains of the present in reference to the visits to the tomb.

I. We will begin with comparing St. Matthew's account, as the first written, with St. Mark's, as the next in order; the material fact in both, viz. the visit of the party of Salome, being assumed as one and the same.

If the later Evangelist were giving an account of the same transaction as the former, with the knowledge of what he had recorded, as well as of what he had omitted—and supposing that both the accounts would ever after go along in conjunction; he could have no inducement except to say as little as possible upon the part recorded, and to dwell almost exclusively upon the part omitted: nor would any ill consequence result from it, if he did. Now it is certain that St. Mark is altogether silent on the fact of the earthquake—the descent of the angel—and the removal of the stone from the mouth of the sepulchre; all specified by St. Matthew. He speaks only in the first place of the perplexity of the women, while they were still on their way to the tomb, produced by this very cause, the supposed obstruction of the entrance

to it: and in the second, of the unexpected discovery which they made, upon a nearer approach, that the obstruction was removed already.

These were natural circumstances, yet they had been omitted by St. Matthew; and in specifying them now, to such as were previously acquainted with the narrative of St. Matthew, the account of St. Mark only the more clearly exhibits the final end of the seasonable and providential dispensation recorded by him, designed to facilitate the access to the tomb: but unto such as were not acquainted with the narrative of St. Matthew, or did not carry that along with St. Mark's, this last would create nothing but difficulty; it would appear as inconsistent with itself, as with the nature of things; supposing not merely an effect without a cause—the removal of the stone, with no visible means of its removal—though a disproportionate effect to any but an adequate cause; for the stone, he observes, was exceeding large—but such an effect as the reader of *his* Gospel in particular could in nowise have been prepared for. Speaking of the burial on the Friday, he distinctly mentioned the closing up of the mouth of the cave; and speaking of the visit early on the morning of the Sunday, he describes it expressly as open; yet he has interposed no explanation to shew how it came to be so.

To say nothing of the presence of the guard—which also is omitted to be noticed in St. Mark—I have already observed that there was no direct evidence in St. Matthew's account that the women went into the tomb; and yet there is indirect that they did so: ἐξελθούσαι ταχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, xxviii. 8, proves this. They could not have come *out* of the tomb, if they had never previously gone *into* it. Compare also Mark xvi. 8, where it is certain that the women must have

come out of the tomb ; and yet the language employed is the same.

It is clear, then, by implication, that the women in St. Matthew must have entered the tomb ; and consequently, if any thing transpired while they were within it, it is equally clear that St. Matthew has omitted to mention it. The point of time, at which they would enter the tomb, was either during or just after, but not before, the address of the angel, whom they found sitting outside the tomb, and who spoke to them first in that situation. And this might well be : for, among other things which he then said to them, he invited them (verse 6) to come and see the place where the Lord lay. In order to do this, they must needs go into the tomb ; and in all probability, being so commanded, they would go into the tomb. Accordingly, as before observed, St. Matthew supposes them directly afterwards to quit, or come out of, the tomb ; saying nothing of what had happened within. If ought then had occurred there, beyond the mere inspection of where the body of Christ had lien, there would be a clear omission in his narrative. Let us see, therefore, whether St. Mark does any thing to supply it.

As St. Matthew makes every thing take place without the tomb, so does St. Mark make every thing take place within the tomb. Upon entering in, the women, says he, found a young man sitting on their right hand ; that is, as the topography of the Holy sepulchre probably would demonstrate, near the site of what had been the grave of Christ. This angel in St. Mark, if his account is supplementary to St. Matthew's, or, if it is equally true with that, whether supplementary to it or not, must clearly be a *second* angel, or a different one from the angel discovered outside at first. Laying then the two accounts together, we possess in them

both in conjunction the evidence of *two* angels being concerned in the present transaction ; which is a critical circumstance ; for it will prove that, with respect to this fact at least, St. Matthew and St. Mark, instead of being at variance, are exactly consistent, with St. Luke or St. John ; and by the distinct angel whose presence they each of them specify individually, both together equivalent to the two which appear simultaneously in St. Luke and St. John, they are tantamount to either*.

The appearance of this angel is said to have astonished the women, just for the same reason as before ; and perhaps more naturally ; for, after seeing one angel without already, they were probably less prepared than before to see another so soon after within. His language also, like that of the former, is consequently addressed to their fears ; and alludes to the state of their feelings in the same general terms as before. He too, as well as the former, affirms the resurrection of Christ ; but he does not, like him, invite them to *come* and *see* the place where the body had lain ; but, what is the strongest proof that all this was passing within the tomb, he points to it as something before their eyes : ἴδε, ὁ τόπος ὅπου ἔθηκαν αὐτόν—See, here is the place where they laid him. If after this, he sends the same message to the disciples, conveying the same assurance that Jesus should be seen personally in Galilee, as before ; still it is in language somewhat different, such as might be the repetition of a common message by a common party in the communication of it ; and,

* Celsus, apud Origenem, v. 52 : Operum i. 617. D: καὶ μὴν καὶ πρὸς τὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦδε τάφον ἐλθεῖν ἄγγελον οἱ μὲν ἓνα οἱ δὲ δύο, τοὺς ἀποκρινομένους ταῖς γυναῖξιν ὅτι ἀέστη. That Celsus meant to urge this as an objection appears from

cap. 56. Ibid. 621. A. Speaking of the Evangelists in the plural number, where he talks of those who mention *one* angel, he means of course Matthew and Mark ; where, of those who mention two, he means Luke and John.

with the addition of a very observable particular omitted in the former instance, the express mention of the name of Peter. It is not to be supposed that either of the ministering spirits employed on this occasion came of their own accord; nor, if they were expressly sent, that they were not commissioned for a definite purpose; in the attainment or execution of which both might be expected to take an equal part.

On this question, however, we may consider it by no means improbable that St. Matthew's usual conciseness must be strictly taken into account. Suppose the women, as invited by the first angel, to have entered the tomb after verse 6. in his narrative, the substance of verse 7. will be part of the address which afterwards took place within it, and will be capable of a literal harmony with Mark xvi. 7. The account, even in this case, would be regular; exhibiting an omission indeed, but no transposition. Nor is it any material objection that the command in question is ascribed to the first angel, whereas it must in reality have proceeded from the second. It is still the same command—and a command which proceeds from an angel—to do so and so, and to expect such and such an effect; which is all that was proposed by recording the command itself.

It must now then be sufficiently probable that St. Mark's account of the visit to the tomb is designedly supplementary to St. Matthew's; and in a part of the latter, where there was an observable omission. The particulars of what transpired within the sepulchre were very deserving to be made known, especially by a later Evangelist, if they had been passed over by an earlier; since there would thereby be placed upon record the testimony of two angels instead of one: and yet they were so nearly akin to the particulars which had transpired without, that an Evangelist, who had minutely

related *these*, might very well dispense with the further narration of *those*.

There is but one circumstance in which St. Mark may appear to differ from St. Matthew, any otherwise than as a supplementary might differ from a more partial account; and that is in reference to the time of the visit. This time the former defines by ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου; the latter by τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ—where the ellipsis is not of ἡμέρα, but of ὥρα*—εἰς μίαν σαββάτων†. St. John, speaking of the same time, describes

* Eusebius, (SS. Deperditorum Vat. Coll. i. 64. D.) Quaestiones ad Marinum: ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελιστὴς Ματθαῖος 'Εβραϊδὶ γλώττῃ παρέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον' ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν 'Ελληνων φωνὴν μεταβαλὼν αὐτὸ, τὴν ἐπιφώσκουσαν ὥραν εἰς τὴν κυριακὴν ἡμέραν ὁψέ σαββάτων προσείπεν.

† The first part of this verse down to σαββάτων is perhaps improperly translated in the authorized version. It is an obvious objection to this version that it makes the first σαββάτων denote the *sabbath*, and the second the *week*; instead of supposing both to denote the same thing. Nor can the adverb ὁψέ, as some commentators would have it, be correctly rendered *after*; which would make it a preposition equivalent to μετά; since its proper signification, according to its nature as an adverb of time, is simply that of *late*. In this sense too its natural construction is with the genitive. The words ὁψέ δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, ought to be rendered, Now late in the week—at the hour of dawn against the first day of the week—where if there was any ambiguity in saying *Late in the week*,

it is sufficiently cleared up and explained by what is added, At the hour of dawn, against the first day of the week. I do not indeed deny that ὁψέ can never be construed in the sense of μετά, or *after*: but I maintain that it is much more uniformly to be construed in the sense of *late*. Nor do I deny that σάββατα without the article may sometimes stand for the *sabbath*: but I contend that it will stand under such circumstances much more properly for the *week*. Cf. Theophylact, i. 163. D. in Matt. xxviii: 262. C. in Marcum, xvi: 434. D. in Lucam, xviii: 758. C. in Joh. xx.

The following examples of the use of ὁψέ sufficiently prove what I have asserted about it: τῆς ἡμέρας ὁψέ ἦν: Xenophon, Hell. ii. i. 23—καὶ ἡ ὁψέ ἦδη τῆς ἡμέρας: De Venatione, vi. 25—ὁψέ τῆς ἡμέρας ναυμαχῆσαι: Thucydides, iv. 25: cf. iv. 93—τῆς δ' ὥρας ἐγίγνετο ὁψέ: Dem. xxi. §. 108—ἐξελαύνουσιν ὁψέ ποτε τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ἡμέρας: Aristotle, περὶ ζώων, iii. xiii. 3—αὕτη δ' ὁψέ τῆς ὥρας ποτε | εἰσῆλθεν ἐπὶ κώθωνα πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα. Athenæus, xiii. 45. l. 40—ὁψέ τῆς ὥρας οὕσης: Plutarch, Alexander, 16. Cicero, 3—ὁψέ τῆς ἡμέρας: Dio,

it by σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης, which is to the same effect; for σκοτία is properly the dusk or twilight of morning or evening, and not the dark of the night. St. Luke's designation for it is ὄρθρου βαθέος *—which implies the same with St. Matthew's and St. John's.

On this point, however, St. Mark would not be more at variance with St. Matthew than with himself; for

55—ὁψὲ τῆς ἡλικίας ἦψατο παιδείας: De Liberis Educandis, Operum vi. 47—ὁψὲ τῆς ὥρας: Dionysius Hal. Ant. Rom. viii. 85. 1716. 3—ὁψὲ τοῦ μετοπώρου: Lucian, ii. 511. Toxaris, 4—ἀλλὰ ὁψὲ τῆς ἡλικίας: Ælian, Variæ Hist. ii. 23—ὁψὲ δέ ποτε καὶ βραδὺ τῆς ἡλικίας: Heliodorus, Æthiopica, ii. 29—ὁψὲ τῆς ὥρας: Jos. Ant. Jud. xvi. vii. 5. So πόρρω and πρῶτ': ἐκάθεν—δὸν μέχρι πόρρω τῆς ἡμέρας: Xenophon, Hell. vii. ii. 19—πόρρω τῆς ἡλικίας ὄντα: Theophrastus, De Causis Plantarum, i. 21. 224. *ad princip.*—πρῶτ' τοῦ φθινοπώρου—πρῶτ' τοῦ ἔρος: Galen, Operum ix. 33. C. 64. B. Philostratus only, Apollonius Tyan. iv. 6. 174. C: ὁψὲ μυστηρίων: and vi. 5. 269. A: ὁψὲ τούτων; uses ὁψὲ in the sense of *after*. Yet the same author, Heroica, 675. D. and 697. B. ὁψὲ τῶν Τρωϊκῶν, ὁψὲ τῆς μάχης, uses it as in the former instances, in the sense of *late*.

For the construction which the ancient commentators put upon the passage, vide the Epistle of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, to Basilides, Rel. Sacrae, ii. 388. 5: and Eusebius, Quæstiones ad Marinum, SS. Dep. Vat. Coll. i. 64. Quæstio ii. where it will be found explained as above. Suidas seems to have had his eye on this last passage in Eusebius, where, quot-

ing from an ancient commentator (vide Σάββατον) he illustrates the phrase ὁψὲ σαββάτων, by the analogous ones of ὁψὲ τῆς ὥρας, ὁψὲ τοῦ καιροῦ, and the like.

Jerome, Operum iv. pars i. 173. *ad princip.* Hedibæ; observes, Mihique videtur Evangelistam Matthæum, qui Evangelium Hebraico sermone conscripsit, non tam *vespere* dixisse, quam *sero*; et eum qui interpretatus est, verbi ambiguitate deceptum, non *sero* interpretatum esse sed *vespere*: which is a very gratuitous supposition, insomuch as the classical sense of ὁψὲ, the word employed in the translation for the supposed Hebrew of *sero*, is itself not *vespere* but *sero*, and consequently ὁψὲ was the fittest term to be employed. Cf. Ambrose i. 1537. A. in Lucam, lib. x. §. 151. Denique Græcus *sero* dixit, hoc est ὁψὲ, &c.

* Philo Jud. i. 603. 5: De Nominum Mutatione: καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα μέντοι προγελᾶ πρὸς βαθὺν ὄρθρον, μέλλοντος ἀνίσχειν ἡλίου—ii. 109. 27. De Mose: οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἑβραῖοι διὰ ξηρᾶς ἀτραποῦ περὶ βαθὺν ὄρθρον μετὰ γυναικῶν καὶ παίδων ἔτι κομιδῇ νηπίων περαιοῦνται. What Philo calls βαθὺν ὄρθρον, Exod. xiv. 24, is called *the morning watch*; that is, from three to six.

in the same sentence just before he defines the same period of time by *λίαν πρωῒ*. Now *λίαν πρωῒ* cannot possibly mean a period of the day posterior to *sunrise*, or even coincident with it: the first hour of the day, which began throughout the year with the moment of sunrise, would never be called *λίαν πρωῒ*—its usual and its proper designation was simply *πρωῒ*. Thus Josephus, *De vita* ^a, makes *πρωῒ* and *περὶ πρότην ὥραν* synonymous terms. The necessity of the case then must imply that, by both these descriptions which are explanatory of each other, the Evangelist means the same point of time—*after* the break or dawn of day indeed, but *before* the sun was actually visible in the horizon. The dawn of day itself may be called in a certain sense the period of sunrise; because it is the effect of the sun's approach, within a certain distance, to the horizon, whether he is yet visible there or not; and precedes, by a stated interval of time, the moment of his actual manifestation. Ἡλιον γὰρ ἐνταῦθα νοεῖν ὀφείλομεν τὰς ὀρθρινὰς τοῦ ἡλίου αὐγὰς· ἀφ' οὗ γὰρ ἡ ὀγδόη ὥρα τῆς νυκτὸς ἐπιλάβηται, ἕκτοτε ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς μελλούσης ἡμέρας, καὶ ἡ πρωῒα δοκεῖ ἐπιλαβέσθαι ^b. The definition of the time then means no more, than that the visit of the women, early as it was, did not take place in the night time, or before the actual dawn of day.

But *λίαν πρωῒ* may be understood of the time when they first set out; and *ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου* of the time when they arrived at the sepulchre: between which there might be as much as even an hour's interval. If our Lord and his Apostles, ever since their arrival at Jerusalem, up to the night of Thursday, when he kept his Passover in the city, had lodged in Bethany, the rest of his disciples, especially those who

^a 54.

^b Theophylact, i. 163. D. in Matth. xxviii.

had accompanied him from Galilee, it is reasonable to presume, had done the same. Consequently, though on account of something which transpired this very day they might afterwards be living in Jerusalem, yet up to this day their home would still be Bethany; and from Bethany they would set out, on the morning of Easter day, to pay the first visit to the tomb.

Now if a party had to proceed from Bethany, which lay one English mile and an half to the east, as far as Calvary, which lay at least one quarter of a mile to the west, of Jerusalem, it is manifest that besides this distance the whole breadth of the city would have to be traversed; a breadth which would doubtless be considerably increased by the windings and turnings of the streets. The ground-plan of Jerusalem approximated to a square or parallelogram, the four sides of which were nearly of equal extent. We may infer this from the fact that the number of square stades which it is said to have contained is computed by Strabo^c in general terms at 60, while its periphery or circumference is stated by Josephus at 33. If the sides of Jerusalem were each eight stades in length, these two computations would agree very well together; for 8×4 would be 32 for the periphery of the outside walls, and 8×8 would be 64 for the superficial content*. The same conclusion

* It is true, the part called Bezetha, or Cænopolis, (the *new city*,) constituted an excrescence upon the northern flank of the city, which so far disturbed the regularity of the rest of the figure. But this part was not enclosed by the city walls before the time of Herod Agrippa, (B. v. iv. 2): and when Jose-

phus states that the whole circumference of the walls amounted to *thirty-three* stades, I think he does not intend this statement of the additional part in question; but solely of the old city wall before that: for he tells us the outermost or third wall, which included this, contained *ninety* towers; but the

follows from three other computations of the circumference of the walls of Jerusalem, one, by the author of the work ascribed to Aristeas, and two, which are cited by Eusebius in his *Præparatio Evangelica*, one of them from Timochares, a Greek historian, the other from a writer whom Eusebius denominates the *Schœnomètres* of Syria^d: the two former as much in excess, compared with the truth, which is the estimation of Josephus, as the latter is in defect; but all of them divisible, or nearly so, by four. The first of these puts it at forty stades, the last at twenty-seven; between which the mean is very nearly thirty-three*.

The extent of Jerusalem, then, from east to west, in

old city wall, which did not include it, *sixty*; and the space between every tower he estimates at *two hundred* cubits. On this principle the outermost wall contained 90×200 , or 18,000 cubits; and the old wall, 60×200 , or 12,000. If we reduce these cubits to stadia, at the rate of 2000 cubits to five stadia, the outermost wall must have contained *forty-five* stadia, but the old wall only *thirty*: the former of which would greatly exceed the estimated extent of *thirty-three* stades; the latter would square sufficiently exactly with it. Besides which, when Titus surrounded the city by a wall of circumvallation, v. xii. 2, the direction which this took is said to have been from the Ἀσσυρίων παρεμβολή, on the north or north-west, to the lower Cænopolis, in the first instance; and from thence, across the brook Cedron, to the mount of Olives on the north-east; then

southward; and afterwards westward, until at last it came back to the point at which it started on the north. Now by the lower Cænopolis or Bezetha I know not what can be understood except the part which bordered on the deep ravine, situated between Antonia and it. Besides, Titus was already in possession of the outer wall, and of Bezetha, (v. vii. 2, 3, compared also with ii. xix. 4.) when he drew this line around the rest of the city. Now the extent of this line was just *thirty-nine* stadia; a very possible case, if it had to enclose a circuit of *thirty-three*. But on this principle the circuit of the city, independent of Bezetha, must have been *thirty-three* stadia.

* Hecataeus of Abdera (apud Josephum, *Contra Apionem*, i. 22.) about B. C. 312, estimated the extent of the walls of Jerusalem at fifty stades.

^d Josephus, *Havercampi*, vol. ii. Appendix, 113. *ad calcem*. Eusebius, *Præparatio*, ix. 35, 36. 452. B—D.

other words the distance which would require to be traversed in coming from Bethany to Calvary, besides the mile and three quarters already specified, cannot be computed at less than one mile more *. Considering, therefore, the many additional delays which might occur by the way, I do not think that it would be possible for any party of persons to have accomplished the journey, however expeditiously, in less than an hour's time : so that though the women had set out at day-break, they would not arrive at the garden before sunrise : for at the equinox, or soon after it, day-break

* In the Epistle ascribed to Cyril of Jerusalem, (*Operum* 305.) and addressed to the emperor Constantius, there is an account of a remarkable phenomenon, in the form of a cross, which appeared in the heavens on Whitsunday, Nonis Maiis, (May 7,) at the *third* hour, or nine o'clock in the morning; and extended from the summit of mount Golgotha, over a distance of fifteen stades, to the mount of Olives. Vide the same account in Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* ii. 28. 120. D: and Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. v. 541: Julius Pollux, *Chronicon*, 338, 340: Nicephorus, ix. 32. Socrates dates this phenomenon, A. D. 350. or 351. Philostorgius, if he is rightly represented by Photius, iii. 26. 490, supposes this same phenomenon visible not only at Jerusalem, but in Gaul to the contending armies of Constantius and Magnentius—at a time the date of which also might be A. D. 351. The *Fasti Idatiani* confirm Socrates by dating the appearance in question, *In oriente, post Consulatum Sergii et Nigriniani*, A. D. 351: though as to the day of the

month, they place it not, Nonis Maiis, but iii. Kal. Februaries, January 30. I cite the fact merely in illustration of the present question. By the mount of Olives I think we must understand its *κατάβασις*, or base—between which and the walls of Jerusalem St. Luke tells us there was a sabbath day's journey's interval, and Josephus about five or six stades, which amounts to the same thing. From the top of mount Calvary, then, to the foot of the mount of Olives, there was in a straight line, not less than fifteen stades' interval; and from the foot of mount Olivet to the village of Bethany, as we learn from St. John, there was not less than ten. The whole distance, therefore, from the summit of Calvary to the village of Bethany, in a right line, was not less than twenty-five stadia; which by the road, especially if that lay through or by Jerusalem, might easily be increased to seven or eight stades more; making in all a distance of four Roman miles at least in extent.

precedes sunrise by little more than the time in question. Besides, our Lord, as we have seen already, was certainly risen even when the first party arrived: but St. Mark himself says that he rose at $\pi\rho\omega\iota$ —and though that should be understood of the dawn of day, still the women could not have arrived until sometime after. My opinion indeed is that the women set out at dawn, and arrived about the time of sunrise—and that our Lord rose just before the latter period, at the time when the daily sacrifice, accompanied by the offering of the wave-sheaf, was beginning in the temple; the descent of the angel—the earthquake—and the removal of the stone—having also been critically interposed.

II. It is hardly necessary, for the sake of the end which we have now in view, to compare St. Luke either with St. Matthew or with St. Mark. The whole of the preceding discussion has been directed principally to prove the distinctness of the visit recorded by him from that which is recorded by them: in which case his account must be clearly supplementary to their's. I think it is plain that he even refers to their account, or supposes their's to go along with his own; for, xxiv. 2, he alludes to the stone as removed from the mouth of the cave, though the fact of such removal was to be collected only from the two former Evangelists. From the narrative of St. Luke, there would be no reason to suspect even the existence of such a stone. No mention of its apposition occurred in the account which *he* gave of the burial.

It is obvious however, that St. Matthew and St. Mark each record only one visit, while St. Luke records two visits; the second of which, if not the first, is clearly a distinct event from any thing in their accounts; and so far a supplementary one. I shall say no more then upon

this point, except to observe that, if the visits were really different, and that in St. Matthew or in St. Mark was the first of the two, *they* would naturally select that visit for record in particular, both on other accounts, which might be mentioned, and especially because upon *that* visit only was the message transmitted to the Apostles, designed to prepare them for our Lord's personal manifestation in Galilee; on which subject more will be said hereafter. Yet the second visit was a memorable event as well as the first, and an important fact in the general evidence of the resurrection, which deserved not to be lost to the Christian world: and for this reason, as having been passed over by his predecessors, it came within the scope of St. Luke's plan, and might be made the subject of a distinct narration.

III. St. John has related two visits to the tomb; the first of which, as made at the same time with the visit in St. Matthew and St. Mark, and by one among others who was equally concerned in that, I see no reason why we should not consider the same with it. The second, as a visit which arose out of the report of the individual who had made the first, and as a visit ascribed to Simon Peter in particular, I consider it equally probable, is the same with the second in St. Luke. The circumstances of the two visits are perfectly consistent with each other: the only difference between them is that St. John enters more into particulars.

It is usual, indeed, to assume that Peter made a double visit; once with St. John, and again by himself. But this double visit is not only unnecessary, but I will venture to say impossible. There is no room for any such visit except where St. John has placed it, *after* the report of Mary Magdalene, but *before* any manifestation of Christ. If it did not arise from that

report, our Saviour must already have been seen, at least by Mary; before it took place. But this is the visit referred to by Cleopas, Luke xxvi. 24: and, as it is there implied, when that visit took place our Lord had as yet appeared unto nobody. Moreover the same text speaks of the visit as made by more than one person: it recognises, therefore, the presence of John along with Peter—though, indeed, the absence of the name of John, Luke xxiv. 12, would be no objection; for there is a similar omission at xxii. 54, under precisely the same circumstances.

In other respects, St. Luke's visit and St. John's are substantially the same. The former by no means affirms that Peter did not go into the cave, as well as stoop down to look into it: he merely affirms that he did the one first; but he leaves it open to conjecture that he might still do the other afterwards. And, what is a critical circumstance, both the accounts specify the *haste* of the parties who made the visit; which, as a common feature of resemblance between them, proves the occasions to be the same. For this haste was the natural effect of the first intelligence that the grave of Christ had been found open, and the body, as it was supposed, removed. It would not have occurred on a second occasion, after these facts had been ascertained by ocular testimony on a former.

St. John's account, then, manifestly may be supplementary to St. Luke's: let us see, in the next place, what purpose it serves with respect to St. Matthew's or St. Mark's.

Early in the morning on the first day of the week, while it was still dark, Mary of Magdala, says he, ἔρχεται, which may very well mean *sets out to go*, to the tomb; and seeth the stone removed from the tomb. There is no intimation in these words that she had yet

entered the tomb. She runneth, therefore, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved; to make a report of this discovery. The language of the original is descriptive of haste and surprise; and leads to the same conclusion, that she could not have stayed to enter the tomb, but, as soon as she saw that the stone had been removed, she must have run back directly, to tell Peter and John.

Now what would be the state of the case with respect to this discovery? It would be such, that it must needs be made without the necessity of approaching close to the tomb, much less of entering into it. Our Lord had been crucified on mount Calvary, that is, upon elevated ground; and he had been buried hard by where he was crucified, that is, upon elevated ground. His sepulchre was hewn out of the rock, descending with steps into an antechamber, below the surface of the ground *. The mouth, the only part visible externally, was a large orifice, covered by an equally large stone. The women had accurately marked the site of the grave on the Friday evening; and when the beams of the morning sun at that very moment were probably shining directly upon the tomb, the stone at its mouth might be seen in the daytime a good way off. The approach to the garden was necessarily up a rising ground; the garden, and the rock which contained the sepulchre, lying somewhere upon the top, or perhaps in the slope of the hill. The women would approach it in front, where

* In Dr. Townson's *Observations on section i. of his Harmony of the Accounts of the Resurrection*, (vol. ii. 78. London, 1810.) there is a ground plan of the Holy sepulchre, taken from Cotovicus and Sandys; that is, of what has been exhibited as the Holy sepulchre,

since the time of Constantine. This also fronts to the east. In other respects, however, the description which is given of it does not appear to me to answer to the idea of the place of our Saviour's burial, such as it may be collected from the gospel accounts.

they would command a full view of it. Hence, according to the very correct expression of St. Mark, they had only to *lift up* their eyes in order to distinguish the sepulchre as they were coming towards it; and to perceive, as we are told they did, that the stone had been removed from the entrance.

It will be admitted that such a discovery would naturally strike them with surprise, and lead them to conclude from the first impression that, if the stone had been removed, the body must have been removed also. It should be remembered, too, that the guard would be still present when they arrived; they would see the vacant mouth of the cave beset by strangers: and laying this discovery along with the other, they could scarcely fail to conclude that the body had been removed, and that these men had been instrumental in removing it: they had come upon them in the act of so doing.

What then do we observe to take place? Mary Magdalene, a single woman, the youngest, and therefore the most active, of the party, runneth immediately, and cometh to Peter and John with a report to this effect—*They* have taken away the body of the Lord, and *we* know not where they have laid it. These words prove two things; first, that she has some particular persons in her eye when she says, *They* have taken away the body of the Lord—such as the guard might be; and secondly, that she was not alone, she had not made the observation by herself; there were *others* with her—if she says *We* know not where they have laid it. Compare this language now, with what follows at verse 13, when she was unquestionably by herself, and is repeating the same declaration to the angels—*They* have taken away my Lord, and *I* know not where they have laid him.

There is then internal evidence in this passage that Mary Magdalene had either, in the first tumult of surprise and consternation, left Salome and the other Mary of her own accord, or had been sent back expressly by them, to communicate the above tidings; while they themselves went on to the tomb, intending, perhaps, to wait there for her return. Either of these suppositions will account for the sequel. But as to conjecturing that all turned back in conjunction, or that this report, ascribed to Mary, was the report made by all in common after each of them had visited and inspected the tomb; these are conjectures which would involve us in the greatest perplexity, and happily are not necessary.

To admit, for argument's sake, the latter. Mary of Magdala, on this principle, must have seen and heard the declarations of the angels, as well as her companions. But had this been the case, could she have said to the Apostles so soon afterwards, They have taken away the body of the Lord, and we know not where they have laid it? Are not these words spoken under a sincere conviction that this was the truth? Does she not still labour under this conviction when she returns to the tomb with Peter and John? Does she not remain behind, after they were gone, through the same belief? Does she not express the same conviction to the two angels directly after? Are not the tears, which she is described as shedding, the tears of a sincere grief, and the genuine tokens of a firm persuasion of the reality of her mistake? Does she not address our Lord himself, at first, like a person under the same impression? Could she have seen and heard the two angels once already, and not have known or suspected who they were, when they appeared and spoke to her a second time? It is morally impossible

that Mary of Magdala, had she been a party to the preceding visit throughout, or even yet heard of what had happened to her former companions, could have acted thus strangely and inconsistently. The female disciples of our Lord, to their honour be it spoken, do not seem to have evinced from the first, the same incredulity as the men. They believed the assurance of the angels that he was risen: they recalled to mind his own predictions in time past; and were now convinced of their truth. They issued from the tomb with great joy and gladness, as well as astonishment; and they delivered an accurate report of what they had seen and heard, that so the rest, if they would, might believe as well as they.

The way, then, to harmonize the account of St. John with the accounts of the other three, is that which we have adopted: supposing that both parties of women had visited, and left the sepulchre, before Mary returned with Peter and John. This might easily happen if the second party arrived soon after the first; and the circumstance that both parties set out very nearly at the same time in the morning, renders it extremely probable that, though they might not come together, yet they would come within a little while of each other: and Mary had to go back to Bethany, and to return from Bethany again; which would take up two or three hours' time at least. It is morally certain that she in particular could have had no communication with her former companions, or with those of Johanna's party, before she had the vision of the angels herself; she must have been still ignorant of all which had passed, even when Jesus himself stood before her. Nor ought it to be objected that the visit of Peter, according to St. Luke, arose out of the report of the women whose names he mentions.

It arose out of their report, but not necessarily out of their report in common. St. Luke's conciseness in this part of his narrative is an answer to the whole objection. He asserts in general terms that the women made a certain report to the Apostles; and in equally general terms that, whatever it was, the Apostles did not believe it; only that Peter got up, and ran to the tomb, to have ocular testimony of what had happened: in all which he is confirmed by St. John. But he does not descend into particulars, nor ascribe the visit to the single report of Mary Magdalene; for this obvious reason, that he had mentioned no previous visit of Mary's. What, then, could he have said of any report which arose out of it, except as identified with the common report of the rest? Yet by mentioning Mary Magdalene before Johanna, as the author of the report, he may perhaps assert by implication that the report came first from her.

In fact, the Gospel of St. John has here one special object in view, and that, entirely a supplementary object; viz. to give an account of our Lord's personal manifestation to Mary Magdalene, memorable, as being the first manifestation which was made to any, yet only summarily mentioned by St. Mark, and totally omitted by St. Luke. This manifestation ensued on Mary's second visit to the tomb, along with himself and Peter; and his own visit and Peter's arose out of Mary's report upon her first. The accomplishment of such a design required him to begin with the account of this first visit, without which he could not proceed to the second; yet as neither Salome nor the other Mary had any concern in what followed, or were parties in the second visit, he confines his account of the first to the single case of Mary Magdalene in particular. Beginning with the relation of her visit, he

passes in due course to the circumstances of his own and Peter's: and when they two were both gone away, he completes his original purpose by the account of the manifestation to Mary itself.

But this brings us at once to the consideration of these manifestations; on which we may enter with so much the more alacrity, that every difficulty in regard to the preceding question, which concerned the visits to the tomb, has now I trust been satisfactorily removed. There is much less of difficulty concerning this further question; and what there is, is due almost entirely to a single cause, the apparent incongruity between St. Matthew's account of the personal manifestations of our Lord after his resurrection, and the history of the same things by the rest. Of the eight or ten manifestations in all, which stand upon record, he has specified only two: but these, as I shall shew, were closely related to each other: and if the first of them, as I hope also to make it appear, was much later than Easter-day, even this incongruity between the several accounts will be completely and convincingly done away.

First, then, it is certain, from the testimony of St. Mark, that the first manifestation of our Lord, as again alive after his death and burial, was made to Mary of Magdala. If this was the manifestation minutely related by St. John, it was made to Mary when she was by herself, after her return to the sepulchre and the departure of Peter and John. It was a distinct thing, therefore, from the first of the manifestations recorded by St. Matthew; which was made to a number of women in conjunction, or at least not to Mary of Magdala by herself. The same conclusion is implicitly confirmed by St. Mark. Speaking of the visit to the tomb, he mentioned the presence of the other two besides Mary

Magdalene; speaking of the first manifestation, directly afterwards, he specifies the presence of Mary alone. There is no reason to be assigned for this distinction except that, though the other two might be parties in the visit, Mary only was a witness of the manifestation.

The narrative of St. Mark, as far as the close of the visit, accompanies St. Matthew's throughout; and had so remarkable an event, as the personal reappearance of Jesus Christ to the individuals who made the visit, taken place immediately upon their quitting the tomb, it is morally improbable that he would not have noticed it. It must have formed a part of the history of the visit; and by far the most important part too. Besides which, the very end which he proposed in his account of the message of the angels, repeating the assurance that Jesus should be seen in Galilee, preparatory to the actual manifestation which St. Matthew records to have taken place there, required an account of the message of our Saviour also, had both messages been sent on the same day. The form of his narrative, in speaking of the appearance to Mary, shews that appearance to have had no connection with the preceding visit; to have been, what it was in reality, an independent and a later account.

Our Lord sent a message at the time of the appearance, Matt. xxviii. 10; and he sent a message also at the time of the appearance, John xx. 17. If these two appearances were the same, the messages must have been the same. Yet what is there in common not merely in the terms, but even in substance, between them? The other circumstances also are quite different: when Jesus appeared to Mary, he appeared at first in another form; and was not recognised until some time after: when he appeared to the women in

St. Matthew, he was recognised from the first. To Mary he appeared in the garden, and close by the sepulchre—to the women, it is certain that he could not have appeared in the garden, or near the sepulchre—for they had left both before his manifestation. To Mary he became visible close by her—to the women, at some distance off. Mary, on recognising him, might have fallen down at his feet, as the other women are said to have done—but Mary could not have embraced his feet, as they embraced; for she was forbidden, doubtless when preparing to do so: μή μου ἄπτου: with this reason assigned—that he was not yet ascended; the time of his final departure from the earth was not come; and until then, he would be frequently visible unto his disciples, and frequently among them still.

We must give up then the authority of St. John, if the manifestation, recorded at large by him, and alluded to in brief by St. Mark, as made to Mary Magdalene, was the manifestation recorded by St. Matthew, as made to the women who visited the sepulchre. These women might have had such a manifestation; but it is clear that either it was a distinct manifestation from this in St. John, or that Mary Magdalene in particular could not have been one who witnessed it. And this conclusion is of great importance; for if it was a distinct manifestation from this, it was not the *first* which took place on Easter-day; and if it was not the first which so took place, it could not have happened when the women were leaving the sepulchre. Nor is this all: for if it was not the first manifestation on Easter-day, there is no reason to suppose that it could have taken place *on* Easter-day at all.

Besides the manifestation to Mary, there are three others on record as made in the course of this day;

and these three so connected together, that unless the manifestation in St. Matthew happened before them all, that is, either before the manifestation to Mary or directly after it, it could not have happened on the same day with the rest.

That it could not have been prior to the manifestation to Mary is proved by the testimony of St. Mark: that it was not the same with it is proved by the reasons urged to that effect above: that it was not immediately posterior to it is not less certain from the absurdity of a contrary supposition. For this could not be the case unless Mary of Magdala, after the appearance to herself, had fallen in with the other women; and along with them seen another appearance of Christ. But these women were gone long before she returned to the tomb; so that she could not have fallen in with them, especially as they were coming away from the tomb: and they had delivered their report to the Apostles of what had transpired at the tomb, before Mary made known what had subsequently occurred to herself.

Besides, though we were to suppose it possible that, after the personal manifestation of our Saviour to her in particular, she might rejoin her companions before the return of any of them to the Apostles; still the rule, by which the appearances of Jesus on Easter-day were very observably regulated, renders it presumptively certain that no second appearance to the same parties was to be expected so soon after the first. A personal manifestation of Christ alive again to those who had known him before his death was demonstrative proof of his resurrection. This irresistible evidence was not all at once vouchsafed; nor would it perhaps have been proper that it should be. The minor or subordinate evidence was first to produce its

effect. The personal inspection of the tomb, and the testimony of the angels, were the only media of conviction for a time. These were submitted to the women; and through them to the rest of the disciples: and some interval was necessary to ascertain their proper effect, before the sensible evidence of appearances of Christ in person was to be resorted to. Accordingly, even the first such manifestation, the manifestation to Mary, took place, as we shall see by and by, comparatively late in the morning; and the appearances, which came after it, still later in the course of the same day. Even this personal manifestation, though the first of its kind, was made but to *one* witness; the next, only to *two* witnesses; and the last or latest of all only, to the whole body of the Apostles in conjunction. Is it credible then, that so early as the very first visit to the tomb a manifestation would take place to a party of women collectively?

It is clear from Luke xxiv. 22–24. that the two disciples who, in the course of this morning, visited Emmaus were not ignorant of the visits made to the sepulchre, nor of the report of the women who had made them; but they were ignorant of any personal reappearance of our Saviour alive, either to them, or to any one else. Yet Cleopas, one of the two, was the husband of Mary, the mother of James; and this Mary, as all the first three Evangelists attest, was one who visited the sepulchre; and if any manifestation of Christ followed upon that visit, was one who witnessed this manifestation. Is it possible, then, that Cleopas could not be aware of *this* fact, as well as of the *other*, if his *wife* had been equally a partner in both? Nor can it be said that he derived his acquaintance with what passed at the tomb from the return and report

of Johanna's party; to which there is no proof that any manifestation was vouchsafed. The party of Salome returned before the party of Johanna; and it would be absurd indeed to suppose Cleopas acquainted with the result of the visit of the latter, yet ignorant of the result of the visit of the former. Besides he was aware that a visit of Peter's arose out of that result; and we have shewn already that the visit of Peter arose out of the report of Salome's party, and not out of that of Johanna's; he was aware, therefore, of the report of Salome's party, before he set out: but he was not aware of any appearance of Christ: he was not aware then, that Christ had yet appeared to that party. We may consequently take it for granted, that when they made their report Christ had not appeared unto them. If so, he could not have appeared to them on their way back from the tomb.

The appearance to these two disciples is the very first upon record in St. Luke, and the second in St. Mark; the next which is specified in both being an appearance to the Eleven as such. It is just to infer from this, that the appearance to the two disciples was either the first, or the next to the first, in the course of this same day; and the language of St. Mark supports and confirms this conclusion. For as he places the appearance to Mary at the head of all, so he places the appearance to the two disciples the next in order to that; applying the note of time *πρῶτον* to the former, and that of *μετὰ ταῦτα* to the latter. Reasonable it is to infer that he is reciting distinct, successive, manifestations, each in its proper order. The earliest manifestations of our Saviour were doubtless the most interesting, and perhaps the most memorable. Had the appearance to the women in St. Matthew been of this number, it is to

be presumed that St. Mark would have noticed it accordingly. He specifies an appearance to *one* witness; and then an appearance to *two* witnesses: would he have omitted an appearance to at least *three* witnesses, if any such came between the two?

The final end which St. Matthew proposed in his account of the resurrection renders it necessary to suppose that the two manifestations, recorded by him, were intimately connected together; and each of them posterior to Easter-day. That final end may be ascertained as follows.

At the time of the first manifestation a message was sent to the Apostles, commanding them to return into Galilee; with a promise that *there* they should see the Lord. At the time of the second manifestation they were accordingly got back into Galilee; and our Lord, as he had promised, *was seen* by them there. Laying these two facts together, no reasonable person can doubt that the Apostles must have left Jerusalem in obedience to *that* command; and repaired into Galilee for the sake of *that* manifestation. The narrative itself implies as much: for after mentioning an intermediate particular, which had nothing to do either with the message or with the manifestation, it proceeds, And the Eleven disciples went into Galilee; to the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. I infer, then, that the express design of the first manifestation was to send *this* message; and the express design of the message was to command *this* return: and the express design of the return was to witness *this* second manifestation on a particular mountain in Galilee. It is to record this single demonstrative proof of the resurrection of Christ, that St. Matthew's narrative is directed throughout: and it begins to prepare the reader for it long before it takes place. The pre-

diction of our Lord, xxvi. 32, on the way from the supper chamber to the garden, first raised the expectation of it: the prediction of the angels, on the morning of the resurrection, xxviii. 7, revived and reinforced the promise of it: the command, sent by our Lord himself, xxviii. 10, brought it still nearer to its accomplishment: and the actual manifestation at last, xxviii. 16—the end, confirmed and fulfilled the whole.

All these steps were manifestly so many links in the same chain; by which the beginning, and the middle, and the end of this one transaction were connected together; every step down to the final result being preliminary to another. Yet they are particulars exclusively confined to St. Matthew; or (what I consider almost the same thing, and among the strongest proofs of the unity of design and plan in these two Gospels) they are partially recorded only by St. Mark besides. The manifestation in question was doubtless the most solemn and most public of any which ever took place: for it was made according to an express appointment of our Lord himself; at a time, and on a locality, of his own fixing; in a country which had been the principal scene of his ministry; and if we may advance a reasonable conjecture, to an assembly of spectators, who must have been collected for the purpose, and embraced perhaps the entire body of believers in Galilee. For I make no doubt that this was the very manifestation spoken of by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 6, as made to more than *five hundred* brethren at once. Five hundred persons could never be present at the same time and in the same place, so as simultaneously to witness an appearance of Christ, except by appointment; and no manifestation of Christ was ever made by appointment, as far as we know of, except this. This manifestation in St. Matthew, then, and the other

in St. Paul, so far agree together. Besides which, five hundred believers could not have been got together in any place at once, between the resurrection and the day of Pentecost, except in Galilee: it will be admitted at least that, even before the day of Pentecost, our Lord might have had five hundred disciples in *Galilee*; but it is by no means certain that he might have had so many in Jerusalem; or in Judæa. The number of names, who were living together in the former place, at a time posterior to this event, was only one hundred and twenty. Besides, as Galilee had been almost the exclusive scene of our Lord's ministry while he was still alive, it was to be expected, *a priori*, that it would be made the scene of some peculiar and distinct manifestation of him after his resurrection; and that those who had believed in him there, as in their Messiah, before he suffered, should have the means and opportunity vouchsafed to them of believing in him still, after he was risen. St. Matthew's manifestation and St. Paul's, if they were both the same, do admirably agree to this natural presumption, as well as illustrate and explain each other; the former as decidedly made by appointment in Galilee, and the latter as equally probably made to what may be considered the whole body of believers in that country.

That others were present at it besides the Apostles is implied even by Matt. xxviii. 17: for those who *doubted* upon this occasion could not be any of the Eleven. Now among these independent witnesses of the personal existence of Christ after his death and burial, that is, of his resurrection, the greater part, according to St. Paul, were alive at the time of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, twenty-five years after the event: and when St. Matthew's Gospel was written, fourteen or fifteen years earlier, they might

every one of them be so. With reason, then, has he confined his account of the sensible proofs of the resurrection of Christ to this single manifestation, made to so many others besides the Apostles; the witnesses of which, at the time when he wrote, composed an integral part of the Hebrew church; and by whose testimony the fact was still capable of being confirmed long after the Apostles had either quitted Judæa, to preach Christianity elsewhere, or been removed by martyrdom; and so closed their career itself. Every other manifestation was either confined to the Apostles, or made, at the utmost, to one or two persons distinct from them; and every other manifestation, in comparison with this, was in some sense a casual and certainly an unexpected and unforeseen event. Of this only were the spectators apprised beforehand; and consequently, of this only had they reason also to entertain the expectation beforehand. We may look upon this manifestation, then, as the manifestation *κατ' ἐξοχήν*; as that manifestation in particular by which our Saviour thought proper to confirm the reality of his resurrection with the greatest publicity, and in the most solemn manner. The fact of such a manifestation is an answer to the common objection, why Christ did not appear in person after his resurrection to the same people, among whom he had been personally conversant before his death; for it proves that he did so appear to those who alone could have any reasonable claim, *a priori*, to the privilege of seeing him after his resurrection; viz. to those who alone had known and believed in him before his death. It is that manifestation which a Gospel that was first written, and written upon the spot, would naturally, and perhaps exclusively select for narration; and St. Matthew's Gospel, by confining itself to this, and saying nothing

of any other which was not connected with it, has not only discharged the duty of a Gospel in general, (which never could have been discharged without some account of the personal manifestations of Christ alive after his death,) but has communicated an integrity and an unity to its own account, which the later narratives, in the nature of things, could not communicate to their's.

Now a message of this sort, and designed to conduct to an effect like this, it seems morally certain never would be sent, much less acted upon, before the disciples had been fully convinced of the reality of the resurrection itself. But they were not convinced of this, until the evening of Easter-day. St. Matthew does not so much as insinuate that *this* report of the women was disbelieved; and yet it is certain that every report on Easter-day, prior to that of Peter, was disbelieved: but he does more than imply, he expressly affirms, that the apostles acted in conformity to the message now received—they set out as they were commanded. And if this was the case, we may take it for granted that they set out *as soon as* they were commanded: they could not have received the message on *one* day, and obeyed it only a week afterwards. The time when they set out then, is virtually the time when they received the command; and consequently while there is proof that they were still in Jerusalem, that is, that they had not yet set out for Galilee, there is proof that they had not yet received the command to depart thither.

Now it may be collected from John xx. 19. 26, and Luke xxiv. 33, that the Apostles were still resident in Jerusalem, and in the same place, within that city, where they had been assembled on the evening of the sixteenth of Nisan—eight days or one week after that

date; which cannot mean earlier than the twenty-third, and may mean as late as the twenty-fourth. They had not, therefore, left Jerusalem to go into Galilee before the 23d of Nisan: for as to supposing that they might have been thither, and returned thence again, after the sixteenth and before the twenty-third, it is too absurd to require any disproof. Yet, John xxi. 1, at the time when *that* incident happened, the Apostles were certainly in Galilee. Consequently they must have gone thither between John xx. 29. and xxi. 1. Between these extremes, then, they must have received the command which instructed them when to proceed thither.

That they would not receive any such command before the twenty-first of Nisan, at least, may be further argued as follows. The final end of sending the message in general, besides the proposed manifestation ultimately to ensue upon it, had in view the necessity of special instructions for directing the motions of the Apostles, now that they had been deprived of the constant presence and superintendence of Christ himself. Obedience to the law would require their continuance in Jerusalem, under any circumstances, till the feast of the Azyma was over; and under the circumstances of their attendance on this occasion, perhaps more imperiously than ever. The same obedience, however, would not require their attendance later than the twenty-first of Nisan; yet St. John has shewn they were still there on the twenty-second and the twenty-third. The first of these days, it is true, was a sabbath; but the second was not. They might then, have left Jerusalem on the latter, if they had not thought it their duty to remain there still. It was a special admonition, therefore, which instructed them to return to Galilee. And as they received such direc-

tions when to leave Judæa, so did they probably receive similar instructions when to return thither again. They were not still there some time after the 23d of Nisan ; but they were again there some time before the 26th of Jar ; which was the day of the Ascension into heaven.

To this explanation of the first manifestation in St. Matthew there are two objections ; which I shall proceed to consider. The first is, that the words *ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ*, xxviii. 9, by restricting the manifestation to the day of the resurrection, are at variance with it. But if these words were absent from the text, that verse would begin with *καὶ ἰδοὺ* merely ; the usual formulary, both of transition and of connection, which occurs so often in St. Matthew, when he would pass from one memorable particular to another, without affirming any thing of the relative order between them ; of which idiom, ix. 1, 2, in his Gospel is decidedly an example.

It may be added, not because the argument requires it, but on purely independent and critical principles, that there is good reason to suspect the words in question to be an interpolation. The difficulty to which we should be reduced by retaining them, and supposing them to have come from St. Matthew himself, is almost self-evident : and I think it is such that no skill nor ingenuity, without the most unwarrantable and gratuitous assumptions, could succeed in harmonizing this Evangelist with the rest. Now they are marked in Griesbach's edition of the New Testament with the note of *probable* omission—which means with him only one degree removed from certain or unquestionable spuriousness. Besides Origen and Chrysostom, they are not acknowledged by Jerome or by Augustin—they are wanting in *all* the most ancient of the ver-

sions, such as the Syriac or Peschito—the Arabic—the Persic—the Armenian—the Coptic—the old Italic*—and the Saxon—and what is more, they do not appear in the Codex Vaticanus—or the Codex Bezae. Their absence from this last manuscript is perhaps one of the most decisive indications of their apocryphal character; for there is good reason to believe that this manuscript is among the most ancient in existence; and still more that it exhibits the state of the Vulgate text prior to any of the recensions, whether Origen's, Hesychius', or Lucian's: a state of the text abounding in extraordinary and unauthorized readings, which from time to time had crept into it, and had gradually debased more and more the purity of the original: the common source of all which, however, was some endeavour to clear up, to illustrate, to reconcile or connect the several Evangelical accounts †. The interpolation

* SS. Deperditorum Vat. Coll. iii. Pars ii. 260, there is a version of St. Matthew's Gospel, according to the editor Angelo Maio, older than that of Jerome, which he calls the Codex Claremontanus. In this, too, the words in question are wanting.

† It is observed by Jerome, Operum i. 1425, 1426. Præfatio in iv. Evangelia; Magnus siquidem hic in nostris codicibus error inolevit, dum quod in eadem re alius Evangelista plus dixit, in alio quia minus putaverint, addiderunt. vel dum eundem sensum alius aliter expressit, ille qui unum e quattuor primum legerat, ad ejus exemplum ceteros quoque æstimaverit emendandos. unde accidit ut apud nos mixta sint omnia, et in Marco plura Lucæ atque Matthæi, rursum in Matthæo plura Johannis et Marci, et in ceteris reliquo-

rum quæ aliis propria sunt, inveniuntur.

The interpolation in the present instance, it is true, is nothing which could have been borrowed from any other Evangelist: but it might have been borrowed from St. Matthew himself: and it was just as natural to explain an Evangelist by himself, as one Evangelist by another. It appears to me a probable conjecture that the interpolation itself was made at twice; that the words *ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο* were interpolated first, and the words *ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ* were interpolated next. Now this was manifestly possible; for the former might obviously have been a marginal annotation, founded on Matt. xxviii. 11. and the latter, a similar explanation, founded on Matt. xxviii. 8: and this conjecture is

in the present instance, if it is one, must plainly have had this object in view ; and, consequently, had there not been the most decisive and unquestionable proof of its absence from all the extant copies of St. Matthew's Gospel, it was likely to have crept into general circulation as speedily as any ; in which case it would hardly have failed to appear in the Codex Bezaë, which preserves so many others of the like description. So far from this, however, we might venture to say that for the first four or five centuries all the evidence, which we have to appeal to, is in favour of its non-existence. The Alexandrine manuscript is the most ancient which exhibits it ; yet there is no reason to suppose that this MS. is a better authority than the Vatican *.

strongly supported by the fact that some of the manuscript authorities, quoted by Griesbach, have the one of these, viz. the *ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο*, but not the other, *ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ*—while the best authorities of every kind omit them both.

* As it is confessed that no MS. of St. Matthew's Gospel, at present in existence, is known, or even probably supposed to be of greater antiquity than the fifth or sixth century ; if there are any MSS. of a later date, which contain the words in question, this is no proof that they were always a part of his Gospel. The interpolation itself might be made at a period earlier than the age of the oldest extant MS. yet not before the fifth century. In any case, it is much easier to account for its presence in a given instance, than for its absence ; if the words were originally a part of St. Matthew's Gospel. Why they were ever

left out, if they always belonged to the Gospel, so as not now to appear in some MSS., and in so many of the most ancient versions, it would be difficult to say ; though why they were probably introduced, even had they originally been wanting, very satisfactory reasons might be assigned.

Next to the direct testimony of MSS. in the original Greek, which still want the words in question—and that of the different versions, which, though made at so remote a period, shew that they were absent from the copies used for these translations ; the quotations of the most ancient of the Fathers may be justly appealed to, in proof that they also were strangers to the existence of the words in question. In the *Harmonia*, or *Diatessaron*, ascribed to Tatian, caput 175, began without them : *καὶ ἰδοὺ Ἰησοῦς ἀπήντησεν αὐταῖς* : Et ecce Jesus occurrit illis. Ori-

It may be urged in the next place that xxviii. 11–15, which certainly belongs to the day of the resurrection itself, is placed after this appearance to the women. But this objection ought to have no weight, unless it could be previously shewn that no such phenomenon as the Trajection of facts is to be found in, or to be ex-

gen, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 70. *Opus* i. 440. C. cites the passage as follows: καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον φησὶν ὁ Ματθαῖος· καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὑπῆντησεν αὐταῖς. Again, Eusebius, *Demonstratio Evangelica*, x. 508. B: οἷς ἀκόλουθα καὶ ὁ Ματθαῖος διδάσκει λέγων· καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπῆντησεν αὐταῖς· δηλονότι ταῖς ἀμφὶ τὴν Μαγδαληνὴν Μαρίαν, λέγων· χαίρετε, κ', τ. λ. Cf. also SS. *Dependitorum Vat. Coll.* i. 97. C—100. A. Again, Ambrose, i. 368. D. De Isaac et Anima v. §. 43: Tamen dum vadunt Apostolis nuntiare, miseratus quærentes, Occurrit eis Jesus dicens: Avete. illæ autem accesserunt, et tenuerunt pedes ejus, et adoraverunt eum. Cf. i. 1536. B. C. in *Lucam*, lib. x. §. 147. Hilarius *Pictaviensis*, *Opus* 607. B. in *Matt. Canon xxxiii*: Sed confestim Dominus mulierculæ per angelum adhortatis occurrit, et consalutat: ut nunciaturæ expectantibus discipulis resurrectionem, non angeli potius quam Christi ore loquerentur. quod vero primum mulierculæ Dominum vident, salutantur, genibus advolvuntur, nunciare apostolis jubentur, &c. Again, the metrical paraphrase of Juvenius: (A. D. 328. see Jerome in *Chronico*, and the SS. *Ecclesiastici*, lxxiv. *Opus* iv. Pars ii^a. 122.) Denique præcipiti celerantes gaudia cursu, Talia discipulis referunt, tumultumque relinquunt. | Ecce iteris medio

clarus se ostendit Iesus, | Et fidas matres blandus salvere jubebat. Jerome, *Comm. in loc. Opus* iv. pars i. 142. *ad calcem*: Et exierunt cito de monumento cum timore et gaudio magno, currentes nunciare discipulis ejus. et ecce Jesus occurrit illis, dicens, Avete: and he further observes; Quæ sic quærebant, quæ ita curebant, merebantur obvium habere Dominum resurgentem, et primum audire, Avete.

Augustin, iii. pars ii^a. 138. D. E. De Consensu Evangelistarum iii. 69: Tunc jam, secundum Matthæum, Ecce Jesus occurrit illis dicens, Avete. He adds (G.): Sane Matthæus etiam illud inseruit, abscedentibus mulierculis, quæ illa omnia viderant et audierant, venisse etiam quosdam, &c.

Chrysostom, *Opus* vii. 834. E. 835. A. In *Matt. Homilia* 89. 3: ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐξῆλθον μετὰ φόβον καὶ χαρᾶς, καὶ ἰδοὺ, ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπῆντησεν αὐταῖς, λέγων· χαίρετε ... καὶ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ. Cf. also *Opus* viii. *Spuria*, 266. D. E. in *Pascha* vi. 2. διὰ τί δὲ πρῶται αὐτὸν ὁρῶσιν αἱ γυναῖκες, καὶ εὐαγγελίζόμενος λέγει, γυναῖκες χαίρετε. Also, *Ibid.* 273. C.

The forms of these several quotations agree together: and it seems a fair inference from them that none of the Fathers in question read the passage in *St. Matthew's Gospel* otherwise than as they quote it.

pected from, St. Matthew : the contrary whereof is the case. Yet for this Trajection in the present instance some reasons may be advanced as follows :

I. The message which was sent to the Eleven, with the command to depart into Galilee, was sent by the women, who formed either the whole or part of the company which first visited the sepulchre. And this might very well be the case ; for two of them, Salome and the other Mary, were the mothers of *three* among the Apostles, and therefore more likely to be living with the Apostles than any of the other women ; and if our Lord's male disciples were still in Jerusalem after the twenty-first of Nisan, there is no reason why the female should not be so too. Besides which, this was the first manifestation which had yet been made to these two of the number in particular ; and this is the best explanation of *their* conduct, in the visible emotion of transport with which they were affected by it. There was, consequently, a natural association between the account of *their* visit to the sepulchre, and the account of *this* manifestation, notwithstanding the difference of time between them ; and there was a still closer connection between the message transmitted through them by the angels on the one, and that which was sent through them by our Lord upon the other.

II. If this fact was thus to be anticipated, the next, relating to the report of the guard, must needs be deferred. The account of this report, then, may be a Trajection with regard to the first manifestation ; but it will still be regular with regard to the second. Its present position is the most convenient which it could occupy ; completing the account begun, in reference to this subject, on the Saturday, but not interfering with the connection and proper prosecution of the course of events on the Sunday, and from that time forwards ;

which is the history of the resurrection, as commencing with the visit to the tomb, but not ended until the account of the manifestation in Galilee had been added.

Having thus removed, or endeavoured to remove, every difficulty in the way of a general harmony of this part of the Gospel narrative, I shall conclude with embodying the whole in as compendious a summary as possible: which will include all that yet remains to be said upon it.

I. Τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ, (Matt. xxviii. 1.) or Λίαν πρωῒ, (Mark xvi. 2.) or Ὁρθρου βαθέος, (Luke xxiv. 1.) or Σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης, (John xx. 1.) all which are descriptions, as nearly as possible, of the same point of time; on the first day of the week, the sixteenth of the Jewish Nisan and the seventh of the Julian April, two parties of women, disciples of our Lord and natives of Galilee, who had probably concerted among themselves, as early as the evening of the Friday before, to meet at the Holy sepulchre, and complete the embalment of the dead body of Christ—the one the party of Salome, and the other the party of Johanna—set out accordingly, but from different quarters, and perhaps at somewhat different times, to proceed thither.

II. About the same time, or soon after their departure, and while they were still upon the road, the angels descend from heaven; the earthquake ensues; the stone is removed from the entrance of the tomb: and our Saviour rises from the dead. Matt. xxviii. 2–4. Mark xvi. 9.

III. The party of Salome, being the earlier of the two, in about an hour after their departure, and consequently ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου, Mark xvi. 2. with sunrise or soon after it, arrive first at the tomb; and perceiving as they drew near that the stone had been removed from the mouth, and that the entrance was

beset by a number of strangers, they conclude that the grave had been opened, and the body taken away. Mary Magdalene, as the youngest of the party, is sent back immediately to report this intelligence to Peter and John. The other two women, after promising, perhaps, to wait there for her return accompanied by Peter and John, proceed to the sepulchre, to be satisfied what was the matter. Upon this the particulars ensue, both outside and inside of the tomb, followed immediately by their departure, which are related Matt. xxviii. 5-8. and Mark xvi. 5-8. Though they might have promised to wait for the return of their companion, yet the vision which they saw in the tomb, and the message which they received for the Apostles, are abundant reasons why they would not stay, but make the best of their way back.

IV. When the women were still on the road, the angel also having ceased to be visible externally, the watch, recovering from their consternation, proceed to the city, and make their report. Matt. xxviii. 11-15.

V. Sometime after this, long enough to leave the vicinity of the sepulchre solitary and unoccupied, the party of Johanna arrive; not having met by the way with either Mary of Magdala, or Salome and the other Mary; which, in so large and populous a city as Jerusalem, through which they might all have to pass, would be no improbable contingency: and those things ensue which are recorded, Luke xxiv. 2-9.

VI. After their departure also, and at a period of time which, if she had to go back as far as Bethany, and to find Peter and John, was not perhaps much earlier than the second or the third hour of the day, Mary Magdalene returns, accompanied by Peter and John. Luke xxiv. 12. John xx. 2-10.

VII. Upon the departure of Peter and John, which

might not be until after the third hour of the day, Mary, being left by herself, which might be for some time longer, has the vision of the angels, John xx. 11–13; and immediately after, John xx. 14–18. Mark xvi. 9–11. a personal manifestation to herself of Jesus Christ alive: which is the first of its kind. Her report of this manifestation, on the same supposition as before, could not be made much earlier than the fifth or even the sixth hour of the day.

VIII. Soon after the fifth hour of the day, when the ordinary mid-day repast^g of the Jews would be over*, after the return of Salome and also of Peter, and consequently aware of what had happened to them; but before the return of Mary Magdalene, and therefore ignorant as yet of any personal reappearance of Christ: Cleopas and his companion, whom Origen supposes to have been Simon †, and Epiphanius sup-

* In the Anthology there is an epigram of Posidippus, in which he is supposed to send a message by his boy to a vintner, to supply more wine for a party, waiting in expectation of it. It ends, . . . ἀλλὰ τρώχαξε | ὥρας γὰρ πέμπτης πάντες ἀθροίζομεθα. Anthologia, ii. 49. Posidippi xii. Cicero, Ad Familiares, vii. 30: Ita, Caninio Consule, scito neminem prandisse; because he was made consul suffectus after the seventh hour on the last day of the year. Quarta vix demum exponimur hora. | ... Millia tum *pransi* tria repimus. Horace, Sermonum i. v. 23–25. Jam nunc in balnea salva | Fronte licet vadas, quamquam solida hora supersit | Ad sextam. Juvenal, xi. 204. Sosia, prandendum est; quartam jam totus in horam | Sol calet; ad

quintam flectitur umbra notam. Ausonius, Ephemeris. Cf. Philostorgius' account of the death of Valentinian the younger, A.D. 392: E. H. xi. i. 526. D.

† This supposition occurs in Origen repeatedly: vide Contra Celsum, ii. 62. Operum i. 434. B: 68. 438. D: Operum iii. 274. B: 275. A: Homilia xix. 8. 9. in Jeremiam: iv. 8. A. Comm. in Joh. tom. i. 7: Ibid. 11. B. tom. i. 10.

Basil, Operum i. 988. C. in Isaia vi. has the same supposition. Ambrose is referred to in the SS. Dep. Vat. Coll. i. 178. as quoting the substance of one of Eusebius' Quæstiones ad Marimum, where he calls Cleophas' companion, Ammaon. Vide his Opera, i. 723. B. Apologia David Altera, viii. §. 43. Ibid. 848. E. in Psalm. xxxviii.

^g Jos. Vita 54. Bell. Jud. ii. viii. 5. hann. iv.

Theophylact, i. 555. E. 556. A. in. Jo-

poses to have been Nathanaelⁱ, but whom Luke xxiv. 33, shews not to have been one of the Apostles, set out for Emmaus. The distance of Emmaus from Jerusalem, as stated by St. Luke, is confirmed apparently by Josephus^k. For this distance, which would thus be travelled in the heat of the day, and more especially for the lengthened conversation with our Lord which ensued upon it, we cannot allow less than three or four hours' time. They would consequently arrive at Emmaus about the ninth hour of the day; when it might truly be said that it was towards evening, and the day had begun to decline; though it would not be so late as sunset. Nor would this be much earlier than the ordinary time of the afternoon's repast. At the time of this repast, when it arrived, our Lord was made known to them; and they returned soon afterwards to Jerusalem. This was the second appearance of Jesus—Mark xvi. 12, 13. Luke xxiv. 13–32: and we may suppose that he would appear to them soon after he ceased to be visible to Mary. The disbelief of their report, asserted by St. Mark, is critically true of St. Thomas; and must be understood of him.

IX. Between the time of the disappearance at Emmaus, and the time of the return to Jerusalem, Luke xxiv. 34, confirmed by 1 Cor. xv. 5, authorizes us to suppose an appearance to Peter; the third of its kind this day*. At the time of that assembly of the Apo-

§. 15, Cleophas is mentioned by name, but not his companion. Cf. i. 1130. F. in Psalm. cxviii. Sermo xiii. §. 1. Ammaon is again joined with Cleophas, i. 1541. E. in Lucam, Lib. x. §. 173: which is the passage referred to in the *Scriptores Deperditi*.

Theophylact, i. 491. E. In Lu-

cam, xxiv: *τινὲς τὸν ἓνα τούτων τῶν δύο, αὐτὸν τὸν Λουκᾶν εἶναί φασι διὸ καὶ ἀπέκρυψε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ὄνομα ὁ Εὐαγγελιστής.*

* Theophylact, i. 495. B. in Lucam, xxiv: *ἀνέστησαν μὲν γὰρ κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν ὥραν* (i. e. Cleopas and his companion) *ὑπέστρεψαν δὲ μετὰ πλείους, ὅσας εἰκὸς ἦν αὐ-*

ⁱ Operum i. 67. D. Saturniliani vi.

^k Bell. Jud. vii. vi. 6.

stles, which is spoken of at verse 33, this appearance was clearly a recent event; and that assembly, it is equally evident from verses 41–43, was about the time of the usual supper hour; which could not long have been passed when Jesus appeared among them. One object, or at least one effect, of this manifestation to Peter was probably this; to command the Apostles, who had hitherto resided in Bethany, to reside thenceforward in Jerusalem, choosing for that purpose the same house where they had celebrated the last supper. This would account both for their being found so collected within Jerusalem, at the time of the return of the two disciples, on the evening of this day, and for their being still ever after, as matter of course, in the same place—Mark xvi. 14. John xx. 19. 26: which Acts i. 13, compared with Mark xiv. 15. and Luke xxii. 12, proves almost demonstratively to have been the supper chamber itself. The two disciples might return from Emmaus in half the time which it had taken to go thither: and if they set out a little before the eleventh hour of the day, they would rejoin the Apostles about the first or second hour of the night; when supper would be over, and it might justly be said to be late.

X. Soon after their arrival, Jesus himself appears to the Apostles, Thomas alone being absent; which circumstance may perhaps be accounted for by supposing that he did not yet know of the appearance to Peter, and of the command to assemble and to continue in Jerusalem transmitted by him. St. Luke's mention of τοὺς ἑνδεκα, notwithstanding his absence, constitutes no difficulty. It is a case in point with Mark ix. 35, where the number was *eleven*; and with 1 Cor. xv. 5,

τοὺς ποιῆσαι, τὸ διάστημα τῶν ἐξή-
κοντα σταδίων βαδίζοντας, ἐν αἷς
πάντως καὶ ὁ δεσπότης ὤφθη τῷ

Σίμωνι διὰ μέσον, ὁδοιπορούντων
αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ὑποστροφῇ.

τοῖς δώδεκα, though the number at that time also was *eleven*: and it stands merely as a designation for the Apostles in particular, to discriminate them from τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς in general. Besides, as the absence of none of them was previously specified, their body could be spoken of only collectively afterwards. This is the fourth manifestation, recorded partly by St. Luke and partly by St. John: whose accounts must be arranged as follows—First, John xx. 19–20. parallel with Luke xxiv. 36–40: Secondly, Luke xxiv. 41–43. and thirdly, John xx. 21–23: which will complete the relation of what passed at this meeting. The remainder of St. Luke's account belongs, as I apprehend, to a much later time; the day of the Ascension itself.

XI. After the disappearance of Jesus, what passed between Thomas and the rest of the Apostles, recorded John xx. 24, 25, takes place either the same night, or the following morning.

XII. Eight days after the same time, which I consider to mean eight days inclusive of the sixteenth of Nisan, and consequently on the twenty-third, which, like that, would be on the first day of the week, our Lord appears again, at the same time and place as before; when Thomas also was present: John xx. 26–29. This is the fifth manifestation on record: and as it was made to the whole body of Apostles, I conclude it to be the same which is mentioned 1 Cor. xv. 5; and as accompanied by a specific reproach on the score of unbelief, though that reproach might properly apply only to Thomas, it is also the appearance alluded to, Mark xvi. 14.

XIII. On some day, soon after the twenty-third of Nisan, Jesus appears to Salome and the other Mary, and perhaps to Mary Magdalene along with them; and sends a message to the Apostles that they should

depart into Galilee, promising to appear unto them there : Matt. xxviii. 9, 10. This is the sixth manifestation on record.

XIV. In obedience to this command, the Apostles depart accordingly ; and at some time and place, appointed by Jesus, though not expressly mentioned, when the whole body of believers in Galilee had been previously collected together, the most open and public of our Lord's manifestations takes place : Matt. xxviii. 16–20. 1 Cor. xv. 6. This is the seventh manifestation on record. The number of persons to whom it was made was more than five hundred ; for more than five hundred, whom St. Paul calls brethren, subsequently became members of the Hebrew church : and the place where it happened, which is described merely as τὸ ὄρος, (that is, some well known mountain,) might be Tabor ; but I should rather believe was the same mountain in the neighbourhood of Capernaum, where the two sermons had been delivered, and where the Apostles themselves had been ordained.

XV. Some time after this, and while the Apostles were still in Galilee, Jesus appears to the seven disciples (five of whom, if not the other two, were Apostles) upon the sea of Tiberias, in the manner related by John xxi. 1–22. This is the eighth appearance on record.

XVI. After this, 1 Cor. xv. 7, Jesus appears to James ; by whom St. Paul must be supposed to mean the James then living, and consequently the brother of our Lord and the bishop of Jerusalem. This is the ninth manifestation on record ; and if I may advance a conjecture, its object was to command the Apostles to return to Jerusalem* ; and if so, it would take place in

* Hieronymus, iv. Pars ii^a. 102. a passage from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, trans-
De SS. Ecclesiasticis ii. quotes

Galilee, some time before the twenty-sixth of the Jewish Zif or Jar, and the sixteenth of the Julian May *, which was Ascension-day ; when it is certain they were again in Jerusalem.

XVII. The tenth and the last appearance is that which took place on the morning of Ascension-day, 1 Cor. xv. 7. Acts i. 4-8. Luke xxiv. 44-49: the harmony of the two latter of which accounts will stand as follows :

First, The historical notice of the occasion and place of the meeting, Acts i. 4. Secondly, Luke xxiv. 44-49. Thirdly, Acts i. 5. Fourthly, Acts i. 6-8. The former part of Luke xxiv. 44-49, it is true, may be such as might belong to Easter-day ; but the latter part, and especially verse 49, could not possibly have belonged to any period prior to Ascension-day. The time of this, therefore, must determine the time of the rest.

XVIII. After Acts i. 6-8, and when our Lord and his Apostles were arrived at Bethany, upon that part of the mountain from which he ascended, but before the blessing, in the act of which he was taken up from them, I would place the residue of Mark xvi. from 15.

lated by himself, most probably in reference to this appearance. Dominus autem quum dedisset sindonem sereo Sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum, et apparuit ei. juraverat enim Jacobus, se non comesturum panem ab illa hora, qua biberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum resurgentem a dormientibus. It proceeded to relate how the appearance of our Lord to him was intended to release him from this vow. Afferte, ait Dominus, mensam et panem. Then, Tulit panem et benedixit, ac fregit, et dedit Jacobo Justo, et dixit ei: Frater

mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit Filius hominis a dormientibus.

* This statement is founded upon the supposition that the month Nisan consisted of twenty-nine days: if it were supposed to consist of thirty, the day of Pentecost, the sixth of the Jewish Sivan, and the twenty-sixth of the Julian May, would still remain the same; but Ascension-day, according to the Jewish reckoning, would be one day earlier, the twenty-fifth of Jar, not the twenty-sixth.

to 18. It could have been delivered perhaps at no time so properly as this ; and it is said in verse 19, that after our Lord had spoken unto them he was taken up into heaven : which would thus be literally true.

XIX. After this, on the same day, our Lord is received into heaven, Mark xvi. 19. Luke xxiv. 50, 51. Acts i. 9 : his ascension is followed by the appearance of the two angels, Acts i. 10, 11—the Apostles return to Jerusalem, Luke xxiv. 52. Acts i. 12—they elect Matthias instead of Judas, and spend their time between Ascension-day and the day of Pentecost, in daily resort to the temple, praising and blessing God, Luke xxiv. 53. Acts i. 13—26.

Mark xvi. 20, does not admit of being harmonized with any part of the intervening period ; for it contains in brief an account of the propagation of Christianity from the day of Pentecost, when it properly began, down to the time of the writer, when it had long been established even in Rome. Its proper conjunction, then, is with the first sentence at the outset of the Gospel. Vide Dissertation ii. Vol. i. 121.

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION I.

On the Supplemental relations of the Gospels.

Vide Dissertation i. vol. i. page 40—71.

THOUGH the most material objections which occurred to me, as capable of being urged against the supposition of these relations, were stated, and, as I trust, satisfactorily answered, in their proper place at the outset of the work; there is one objection, however, which may be considered to lie at the bottom of every other, and yet does not appear among the rest. I shall take the liberty, then, of noticing it here; especially since it admits of being refuted with the same facility as any of the preceding.

The objection in question is this: allowing that the Gospels might be written in the order in which they stand, and allowing also that the Gospels last composed might be designed to be supplementary to the Gospels first composed, how are we to know where the one were defective, and where the others are supplementary? None of the Gospels acknowledges its own deficiencies: they all *appear* at least to be continuous accounts: where, then, are we to detect hiatuses in some, and where, consequently, are we to look for the supplement of them in others? It is equally a certain fact both that, where any of the Gospels is really defective, it leaves the discovery of the defect only to implication; and that even where another is supplying this defect, it effects its purpose without declaring what it is doing.

The answer to this question is simple and obvious.

We are enabled to discover deficiencies in *one* Gospel, because we possess *others* which are more complete; we can perceive that some are supplementary, and that others stand in need of supplement, because the narrative of one continues where the narrative of another breaks off. The four Gospels are four distinct histories; and yet the subject to which they relate is one and the same in all. The ministry of our Saviour had its proper beginning, and its proper termination; each of which is marked out in them all alike: its intermediate duration, therefore, besides being something definite in itself, must necessarily be supposed the same in each of the Evangelical accounts; and the corresponding periods in this duration, if they were distinguished by their proper events, must have been distinguished by corresponding events in each.

It would be in vain, in short, to contend that, while the outline of the history in all the Evangelists must be acknowledged to be the same, the distribution and succession of its parts can be materially different. The contrary is more naturally the inference; that as they agree in the *general*, so they should be found to agree in the *particular*: if they begin and conclude together, they must go along with each other in the mean time. Upon the admission of this presumption, the mere comparison of the Gospel accounts demonstrates that some are more or less defective, and others proportionally more or less complete; from which it is an obvious inference that as the former stand in need of supplement, so the latter have furnished it to them. It is a further and a no less obvious inference that the authors of the latter had seen the former; and both were aware of their deficiencies, and wrote expressly to supply them. If there were deficiencies in the one, and there are actually supplements of the same

in the other, it is too much to suppose that these last in particular were made at random. We cannot believe that even the preexisting deficiencies were left in existence by accident; and it is much less credible that the provision, which compensates for their existence, was made and introduced by accident.

It is a notorious fact that sometimes even the four Gospels, but much more frequently the three first, or the two first of them in particular, run parallel to each other, and in such a manner as to leave no reasonable doubt that they are actually proceeding together, and giving an account of the same tissue and succession of events. This fact, I say, is undeniable; and it would be the height of absurdity, beyond what the most bigoted follower of the principle of Osiander himself could be supposed capable of entertaining, to pretend to dispute it. Nor shall I now stop to shew how, even in the circumstances of such accounts as are most clearly identical, some of the Evangelists, and those in every instance the latest, are distinctly supplementary to others, and those the earliest: it has been the main object of the preceding Dissertations to shew that already. All which I think it worth while to observe is this—that if it is possible to discover beyond a question at what period, in a common series of events, any two or more of the Gospels are coincident, or proceeding in conjunction; it must be possible to discover where they cease to be coincident, or when one of them in particular begins to proceed by itself.

This is a case which is perpetually occurring. A joint account is begun, and for a time is continued, by two or more of the Gospel historians: nor do I mean to say, that what they have once begun in common they do not also complete in common. But when this end has been attained, and the integrity of a particular

narrative has been duly consulted, they no longer proceed in conjunction; the thread of the narration is suspended by some one, or more, of the number, though it may be carried forward by the rest. Nor does it happen in these cases, that they never rejoin each other: on the contrary, it is as certain that they do not perpetually go on alone, as that they do not perpetually go on in conjunction. The thread of the narrative may be suspended for a time, but it is never absolutely broken off: and the accounts which were once coincident, and went along with each other, after a certain interval of separation, are found to meet together again, and to become coincident as before. And this alternation is observed to pervade the whole of the Gospels.

Now it is with the duration of these intervals, and with the particular nature of the matter which is found interposed, for any one of these intervals, in one of the Gospels independently of another, that we are chiefly concerned upon the question of their supplementary relations; and of the consequences to which the admission of those relations immediately leads. It would be only to repeat what has been done already, were we to enter upon this examination afresh. I shall observe merely, that the interval in many instances is determined by the internal evidence of the narrative itself; and is sometimes found to embrace even months in extent. And as to the nature of the matter interposed, it frequently constitutes a large and integral portion of a particular Gospel; in St. John and in St. Luke, by far the greatest portion of the whole: in many instances it consists of such accounts as are peculiar to some one Gospel, and have nothing which resembles them in any of the rest; the effect of which peculiarity is, or should be, that there is not, or ought not to be, a

shadow of pretence for questioning the regularity of the position of the accounts in such instances. Though something like what is related there may be found, at a different time and place, in others of the Gospels, yet it has been seen that, without impeaching the similarity of the narratives, it may be justly contended that they are not the same; and therefore, that the position of the one is no criterion of the order of the other: each may belong to a distinct time and place; and therefore, each may naturally be related in its own.

Now when the continuity of one of the Gospel narratives has been broken off in this manner, and yet the thread of the account is carried forward by another; will any one deny that the matter which is thus introduced into the latter is supplementary, as far as regards what is found in the former? Can any one doubt, then, whether the former account was so far defective, and the latter is so far supplementary to it? It is not possible to avoid this inference, except by contending either that the matter, which is thus introduced, is not fresh or additional matter: or that, if it is so, it is inserted out of its place.

With regard to the first of these assertions, I should reply, If the matter, thus introduced, is not fresh or supplementary matter, shew me where it occurred before; and prove to me, beyond the possibility of a question, that the matter, which occurred *there*, is the very same matter which occurs *here*. With respect to the second, I reply, If you cannot deny that fresh or additional matter, strictly so called, is introduced *here*, you have no right to question whether it is introduced in its place or not. Fresh matter, we may presume, would not be introduced *here*, if it did not properly come in *here*; and it could never properly come in *here*, unless the order of the preexisting nar-

ratives had been more or less interrupted *here*. We have no right to suppose that additional matter would be arbitrarily inserted any where; and much less where, by being inserted, it would break and interrupt, not connect and preserve, the continuity of a certain account. No previously entire and uninterrupted narrative would furnish room for any such insertions; and no insertions in any such narrative would appear otherwise than incongruous and out of place. Yet neither of these effects is visible in the cases which we are considering. Nothing appears less continuous than the preexisting narratives, as judged of by their internal evidence, in the particular places where the matter in question may be found incorporated with them; nothing less foreign or inappropriate, as referred to its connection with what precedes or follows it, than the matter which is thus introduced. On this subject therefore these observations may suffice.

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION II.

On the principle of Classification as applied to St. Luke's Gospel.

Cf. Dissertation iii. vol. i. page 237.

IT is a favourite hypothesis of many modern expositors, that, without maintaining the regularity of St. Luke's Gospel, the peculiarities of its structure, which are the immediate consequences of its supposed irregularity, may all be satisfactorily accounted for upon the principle of a certain classification. I have not thought proper formally to combat this hypothesis any where; because it appeared to me to be so utterly destitute of foundation that the best refutation of it would be the *practical*; such as the Harmony of the Gospels itself could not fail to exhibit: nor shall I dwell long upon the consideration of it at present.

Five heads of the classification in question are proposed by Rosenmüller in his Prolegomena to the Gospel; which Mr. Horne also has transferred into his Introduction. If these were proposed as a mere digest or division of the contents of St. Luke's Gospel, it would be perfectly indifferent whether we adopted them or not: for they follow each other consecutively, and the order of the classes is the order also of the chapters. But if it is implied by them, as I presume it must be, that these distinct classes are to be appropriated to so many divisions or successions of events, which must be brought together, and comprehended within them respectively, on the ground of some sup-

posed affinity or connection among themselves, but without regard to the order of time; no supposition can be more gratuitous or more absurd.

For first it is founded altogether on a *petitio principii*; insomuch as it must begin with assuming that the Gospel of St. Luke abounds in irregularities, and possesses no such property as that of a distinct supplementary adaptation to the Gospels in being before it. No principle of classification like this could apply to the constitution of a narrative which was either simply regular, or simply supplementary; and much less to one which was both regular and supplementary; regular, as regarded the order and succession of its own accounts; and supplementary, as regarded the perceptible relation of its own to those of others. It would be abundantly sufficient, then, to sap the foundation of this hypothesis, if we could prove that St. Luke's Gospel in particular possesses in an eminent degree each of these distinctive characteristics; both that of being historically exact in itself, and that of being supplementary to St. Matthew's and St. Mark's: the former of which conclusions will be demonstratively established, if it can be made out that every supposed instance of a transposition in his Gospel, truly and impartially considered, is no such thing; while the latter is almost a direct consequence of the former. For if the Gospel of St. Luke, both where it accompanies the other two Gospels, and where it proceeds by itself, is still a regular account, it follows that where it ceases to accompany the rest, yet continues to proceed by itself, if it does not cease to be regular, it must begin to be supplementary. These two terms are in fact almost convertible. A regular gospel, wheresoever it introduces fresh matter into defective or noncontinuous accounts, must be supplementary; and a supplementary

Gospel, wheresoever it connects or fills up defective accounts, must be regular.

It is an obvious objection, however, to the very principle of this hypothesis, that the construction of a Gospel upon any such plan would be little in unison with the characteristic simplicity of the Gospel historians. Such a method of compiling history might be adapted to a period of advancement in the cultivation of literature, and might recommend itself to the choice of a writer who was ambitious of novelty or refinement; but it would be utterly incongruous in the infancy of history, and repugnant to the disposition of authors who, like the Evangelists, were solicitous about nothing but the truth and perspicuity of their accounts; and neither sought nor wanted any recommendation from the arts of composition as such. The first and most obvious tendency, in writing history, is to follow that plan which the nature of the subject dictates, viz. the order and succession of events; nor could one act contrary to this tendency without doing violence to one's natural sense of propriety, nor without experiencing the bad effects of it in the result. When an historical composition is deprived of that *lucidus ordo*, which is the spontaneous consequence of the *series juncturaque rerum*, it is deprived of what Scaliger denominated one of its eyes; and instead of clearness and simplicity, which ought to be its distinctive characteristics, like a body deprived of sight, it is left to grope about in darkness and confusion.

It is in vain too to search for any parallel to this supposed principle of St. Luke's classification, in the structure of Suetonius' Lives of the Cæsars. There is little affinity between the character of a Roman grammarian, and that of a Gospel historian; and still less between the Life of a Roman emperor, and a Gospel

of Jesus Christ. For though, for argument's sake, we were to admit that any one of the Gospels might be regarded in the light of a *memoir* of Jesus Christ, just as one of Suetonius' Lives may be considered a *memoir* of a particular emperor; what would the two subjects have in common, that they should allow of being handled alike? What would there be in the simple, and uniform, and homogeneous tenor of the Gospel history, to admit of comparison with the complex and multifarious character of the Life of Julius or of Augustus Cæsar? This very diversity might suggest to Suetonius the plan upon which he proceeded in treating of his subject: he might not consider it possible, except by digesting it into a number of distinct assortments or classes, to reduce such a mass of particular facts to order, and to exhibit in their mutual relations, and yet their individual distinctness, the incidents in a certain Life, all tending to compose the history, or to illustrate the character of his hero. But will any one maintain that the simple narrative of our Saviour's personal history could not be related except on this artificial principle; or that the complexity of the subject was such as, *a priori*, to suggest the adoption of it to the writer? Besides which, the Roman biographer had to exhibit in detail the accumulated materials of a great number of years, which in the case of Augustus more especially was little short of a century; whereas the Gospel history, as such, from first to last, cannot be said to contain more than the events of three or four.

The classification of St. Luke's Gospel upon any such peculiar principle, if it implied no more than a division or table of contents, would be, as I before observed, a mere nominal distinction, without any real difference: but if it implies more than this, it must imply, as I

also observed, the collection of distinct particulars into distinct classes ; and consequently upon the ground of some affinity with each other, and some disparity to every thing else. Among the grounds of any such affinity, the hypothesis excludes that of agreement in the order of time ; for it assumes the irregularity of St. Luke's Gospel : and it would be contrary to that assumption that events should be any where considered as classified together out of regard to the order of time. The distribution of events upon such a principle would imply the composition of a regular history. The principle of the classification, then, must have been in every instance the agreement of the things classified between themselves, in some other respect, and not in this. But what agreement in some other respect, and not in this, could be made the ground of a common classification of distinct, individual events, except the possession of some common nature ; that is, the material resemblance of the things themselves ? Events of like kind, it is obvious, might be arranged together on the principle of a certain classification, independently of the order of time ; but what else could ?

Now of this species of classification there is not a single instance to be met with in St. Luke's Gospel : and so far from bringing things together on the ground of any abstract resemblance between them, it is his constant practice to separate and disjoin even those which had a natural predisposition to be united. Among the general events of our Saviour's ministry, he never relates any two in conjunction, because they were of like kind. On this principle, he ought to have given in conjunction the two sermons delivered on the same mount of Beatitudes—the two visits to Nazareth—the two miracles of feeding—the four general circuits of Galilee—the two missions of the Twelve and the Seventy respect-

ively—the two visits to the tomb, on the morning of the resurrection—the ten manifestations of our Lord, after that event—and the like; wherever there is reason to conclude that incidents, perfectly analogous in themselves, must have happened more than once in the course of the Gospel history. In all these cases so little disposition does St. Luke shew to bring things together, which belonged to distinct points of time, that it is a rule with him, of which we have seen many instances heretofore, to relate nothing, which was absolutely identical, twice.

Besides this, a writer, who had deliberately conceived the design of digesting the materials of the Gospel history into distinct classes and divisions of things, could not fail to have fallen into such modes of arrangement, as the nature of the subject itself must spontaneously have suggested. For example, must not our Saviour's miracles, on this principle, have constituted one class—and his discourses another—and the general incidents of his life, a third? Among his miracles, would not those of *one* description have required to be distinctly arranged from those of *another*? and would not the same thing hold good of his discourses? Must not his *ordinary* discourses, by which I mean the substance and particulars of his daily teaching, have been discriminated from his *extraordinary*, by which I understand his discourses of every other kind; the most obvious division of which would be into the *parabolic*, the *prophetical*, and the *controversial*, respectively? It is impossible, I think, to deny that, in a Gospel history framed and constructed upon any such plan as that of this assumed principle of classification, we should have perceived distinct traces of some such divisions as these. Yet not a vestige of them is any where discoverable in the Gospel of St. Luke.

The analysis of this Gospel, in fact, has shewn that it contains nothing which might not be perfectly regular where it stands; which could not, without a palpable absurdity, be taken out of the place already assigned to it, and transferred elsewhere: all which is clearly at variance with the supposition of any principle of composition but the simply historical one—regard to the order of time. It leads to the same conclusion, that as the duration of our Saviour's personal ministry was exactly three years in length, and consequently as the most natural and comprehensive division of the subject-matter of the Gospel history was according to the series and extent of the particulars embraced by each of those years respectively; so were these divisions marked out, with sufficient exactness, in the Gospel of St. Luke: for it was as easy to discover where the several years of our Lord's ministry, began and ended, in this Gospel, as in any except St. John's.

In short its whole plan and œconomy are absolutely repugnant to the notion of such a principle of classification as Rosenmüller and others have supposed: nor is this principle more applicable to the structure of St. Luke's Gospel than to that of St. Matthew's or St. Mark's; to which, however, it has not been transferred. There is indeed a certain peculiarity by which its external constitution stands somewhat distinguished from their's; though that peculiarity is more or less common to them all. What this is, has been mentioned in its proper place elsewhere^a; and while it cannot be confounded with any such assortment or distribution of events, as would correspond to the classification in question, it is also found to be inconsistent neither with the supposition of the regularity of the individual Gospel itself, nor yet with that of its supplementary relation to the Gospels in being before it.

^a Vide Dissertation iii. Vol. i. page 237, 238.

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION III.

On the prevalence of the Greek Language in Palestine, or other parts of the East.

Vide Dissertation ii. Vol. i. page 135. last line—141. line 24.

THE reader will perceive that the discussion of this question is intimately connected with the further inquiry, in what language it is most probable that St. Matthew would write his Gospel, supposing it intended first and properly for the use of the inhabitants of Palestine, the Jews of Jerusalem, or the members of the Christian church established among his countrymen in that city. In addition to what was observed upon this question, when it was before under discussion, a variety of testimonies might have been produced, bearing more or less directly on the points at issue, and calculated to assist the judgment of the reader in forming his own opinion concerning them. These, therefore, I shall take the liberty of laying before him, without entering into any lengthened investigations, or proposing to do more than simply to methodize and arrange the several facts, which I have collected for his consideration.

Among the followers of Xerxes in the invasion of Greece, B.C. 480, the poet Chœrilus described a people, who must be understood to be the Jews, yet spoke the Punic or Phœnician language, as follows * :

* For the age of Chœrilus, see Suidas, Χοίριλος. He designates him as νεανίσκος ἐπὶ τῶν Περσικῶν, Ὀλυμπιάδι σέ'. Eusebius, Chronicon Armeno-Latinum, Pars ii^a. 207. dates his acme

Olympiad lxxiv. 1. Jerome in Chronico, Olympiad lxxiv. 2. The poem from which the lines in question are taken was entitled, Ἀθηναίων νίκη κατὰ Ξέρξου: and the author was rewarded

τῶνδ' ὅπιθεν διέβαινε γένος θαυμαστὸν ἰδέσθαι,
 γλῶσσαν μὲν Φοίνισσαν ἀπὸ στομάτων ἀφιέντες,
 ᾗκουν δ' ἐν Σολύμοις ὅρεσι πλατὴν παρὰ λίμνη^a.

The book of Ecclesiasticus was written in Hebrew, that is, as we may justly presume, in the vernacular language of Palestine; and was translated by Jesus, the grandson of the author, into Greek. This appears from the preface: and independently of that, it might have been collected from such passages as this: “Wisdom is according to her *name*^b,” that is, her Hebrew name; denoting *deep* or *solid*. The author, at the lowest date, is supposed to have lived about B.C. 200; and the translator about B.C. 133.

There are allusions to the native language of the country, in the second book of Maccabees, in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 168 or 167. “He answered in his own language—She exhorted every one of them in her own language—She . . . spake in her country language^c—With that he began in his own language^d *.”

Machabæorum primum librum, says Jerome, Hebraicum reperi. secundus Græcus est: quod ex ipsa quoque φράσει probari potest^e.

In like manner: Fertur et πανάρετος Jesu filii Sirach liber, et alius, ψευδεπίγραφος, qui Sapientia Salomonis inscribitur. quorum priorem Hebraicum reperi . . . secundus apud Hebræos nusquam est^f.

for it with the gift of a stater of gold for every line. The same thing is recorded of the poems of Oppian. Cf. Suidas, Ὀππιανός: Sozomen, Oratio ad Imperatorem Theodosium, E. H. 394. B—D. Also, of the vith Book of Virgil's Æneid. See Servius, ad Æneid. vi. 862.

* Nehemiah xiii. 24. mention occurs of the dialect of Ashdod; that is of one of the cities of the Philistines, (Azotus,) as distinct from that of the native Jews; and *vice versa*. Esther, viii. 9. also, the Jews' language is opposed to the other languages of the time being.

^a Eusebius, Præparatio Evangelica, ix. 9. 412. B. Cf. Josephus, Contra Apionem, i. 22. ^b vi. 22. Cf. xliii. 8. ^c vii. 8. 21. 27. ^d xii. 37. ^e i. 321, 322. Præfatio ad omnes Libros Vet. Test. ^f Ibid. 937, 938. Præfatio in Libros Salomonis.

The book of Enoch, which Dr. Laurence translated from the Æthiopic, and published in 1821, was originally written in Hebrew; as appears both from the etymon of the name Armon or Hermon, which is given in it^g, and because the translation of it into other languages, some time to come, is alluded to in the following passage^h: “But when they shall write all *my words* correctly in their *own* languages.” In their *own* languages, no doubt, as opposed to the Hebrew, the language in which Enoch is supposed to be speaking.

The date of this work may be uncertain. I shall mention only that in the opinion of the learned editor, it was written in the reign of Herodⁱ, before the birth of Christ: and even if written after Christ, it will still belong to the end of the first, or the beginning of the second century.

The Gospel of St. Matthew, according to the Nazarenes, existed in the vernacular Hebrew, in the library of Pamphilus at Cæsarea; and in Berœa of Syria: where Jerome tells us^k he saw it; and translated it. The Gospel according to the Ebionites existed also in the same language. The genuine Gospel of St. Matthew in the vernacular Hebrew, as it has been elsewhere mentioned, was reported to have been carried by the apostle Bartholomew into upper Asia; and to have been found there by Pantænus, before the end of the second century. Epiphanius asserts that translations of St. John’s Gospel, and of the Acts of the Apostles, into the native Hebrew, had been made, and existed in his time at Tiberias^l. Nor is there any thing incredible in such an assertion.

^g vii. sect. ii. 8. See also xiii. 8. 9. ^h civ. 8. ⁱ Preliminary Dissertation, xxiii—xxxvi.

^k Operum iv. Pars 2da. 102. De SS. Ecclesiasticis, cap. 3. ^l Operum i. 127. C. D. Ebionæi, iii: 137. B. Ibid. xii. Philostorgius, E. H. vii. 14. 508, 509: has a remarkable account of the discovery of a copy of the Gospel ac-

The only instances, in which the evangelists have preserved to us the very words of our Saviour; *Talitha cumi*; *Ephphatha*; *Eli Eli, lama sabachthani*; are instances of his speaking in the Hebrew, or the vernacular language of the country. To these we may add the names of *Cephas*, of *Boanerges*, of *Thomas*, of *Barjonas*, of *Bartimæus*, of *Tabitha*, of *Barnabas*, &c.: all of them Syro-hebraic or vernacular denominations; and most of them translated or interpreted accordingly, by what is equivalent to them in Greek. In like manner, the surname, ascribed by Hegesippus to James the Just, *Oblias* or *Munimentum*^m, is vernacular Hebrew*.

* When Marsyas, the freedman of Herod Agrippa, brought him the news of Tiberius' death, he said to him, in the *Hebrew tongue*, "The Lion is dead." Ant. Jud. xviii. vi. 10. In another place, Ant. xx. iii. 4. Josephus tells us that Izates, king of the Adiabenes, who had embraced Judaism, sent five of his children to learn the vernacular language of Judæa, and to be instructed in the law, at Jerusalem. In like manner, Bell. iv. i. 5. the Jews in Gamala, it is manifestly implied, were speaking a language akin to Syriac,

though their own tongue, when they were overheard by some Syrian soldiers of Vespasian's army. The Jews too, stationed on the towers of Jerusalem to watch the discharge of the Roman ballistæ, are said to have warned the defendants of the approach of the stones, by crying out in their *native tongue*—*ὁ λός ἐρχεται*: Bell. v. vi. 3. It was in their native tongue that Josephus, by command of Titus, addressed to the besieged the two harangues recorded Bell. v. ix. 2. 3. &c. and vi. ii. 1: and, Contra Apionem, i. 9. the deserters or pri-

cording to St. John, in a subterranean chamber at Jerusalem, when Julian was attempting to rebuild the temple, A. D. 363; which may be compared with the above particulars from Epiphanius, though I would not vouch for its truth.

The Gospel according to Nicodemus, of which there is a Latin version in the Codex Apocryphus of Fabricius, and a Greek copy in the Auctarium Codicis Apocryphi of Birch, professed to have been written by Nicodemus in Hebrew, and thence translated into Greek, by one Ananias, in the reign of Theodosius the younger and Flavius Valentinianus (Placidius Valentinianus the Third, emperor of the west, when Theodosius the Second was reigning in the east.) This would be sometime between A. D. 423. the first of Valentinianus, and A. D. 450. the last of Theodosius. Vide Fabricius, Codex Apocryphus, i. 298. and Birch, Auctarium, page 3 and 5. Cf. also, the long narrative in Suidas, beginning, *Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ Θεὸς ἡμῶν*, κ. τ. λ. in the part relating to the codex or roll of the priests, supposed to have been still extant in the reign of Justinian, and preserved at Tiberias. Page 1751. A—C. ^m Eusebius, E. H. ii. xxiii. 64. A.

There are extant in Irenæus, and in Epiphanius, some curious specimens of Hebrew forms of prayer; which were in use among certain heretical sects of great antiquityⁿ.

Lucian tells us that the juggler Alexander, whose history he relates in his *Pseudomantis*, made a point of delivering his oracles in a barbarous jargon, resembling Hebrew or Phœnician; the better to impose upon his hearers^o.

Plutarch, in his *Life of Antony*^p, mentions the Hebrews by name, among other nations of the time, who had all their own or peculiar languages; in which however Cleopatra was accustomed to give each of them audience.

On the sepulchre of Gordian the Third, U.C. 997, A.D. 244, was inscribed a *titulus* or epitaph, Et Græcis et Latinis et Persicis et *Judaicis* et *Ægyptiacis* literis, ut ab *omnibus* legeretur^q.

From what Origen observes in his *Epistle to Africanus* on the version of the two terms *σχίνος* and *πρίνος*, in the history of Susanna, it must be evident that Hebrew, or some dialect of it which he calls Syriac, was still spoken in his time^r. Contra Celsum, the same writer observes, πῶς οὖν, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο, οὐχὶ μᾶλλον τῇ Σύρων ἐχρῶντο διαλέκτῳ, ἢ τῇ Φοινίκων· ἀλλὰ τὴν Ἑβραϊδα ἐτέραν παρ' ἀμφοτέρων συνεστήσαντο^s; This is spoken of the Jews after the Exodus, it is true; but it implies

soners from among the Jews, at the time of the siege, must have spoken Hebrew, if, as he tells

us, he alone understood what they said.

ⁿ Irenæus, i. cap. xviii. 2. 90. l. 5. 91. l. 2. Epiphanius, i. 42. Ossen, iv. ^o *Pseudomantis*, 13. *Operum* ii. 221. l. 94. ^p Cap. 27. ^q *Capitolinus, Vita*, 34. Jerome in *Chronico*, ad ann. Gordiani vi. mentions that the bones of Gordian, notwithstanding, were brought to Rome: and *Capitolinus, Vita, loco citato*, that the inscription in question was erased by Licinius, because it reflected upon the Philippi, from whom he himself was descended. For the site of the tomb, see *Ammianus Marc.* xxiii. 5. 361. and *Zosimus*, iii. p. 163. *Aurelius Victor, Epitome, De Gordiano.* ^r *Operum* i. 18. A—B. cap. 6. ^s *Operum* i. 451. B. iii. 6.

that they retained their own language ever afterwards : and he adds elsewhere ; καὶ γὰρ μέχρι τοῦ δεῦρο τὰ Ἰουδαϊκὰ ὀνόματα, τῆς Ἑβραίων ἐχόμενα διαλέκτου, ἤτοι ἀπὸ τῶν γραμμάτων αὐτῶν ἐλήφθη, ἣ καὶ ἀπαξαπλῶς ἀπὸ τῶν σημαινομένων ὑπὸ τῆς Ἑβραίων φωνῆς^t.

Eusebius repeatedly asserts that the apostles, before the gift of tongues, knew no language except their native one ; which he calls the Syriac : μᾶλλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ βάρβαροι, καὶ τῆς Σύρων οὐ πλέον ἐπαῖοντες φωνῆς^u—μήτε λαλεῖν, μήτε ἀκούειν πλέον τῆς πατρίου φωνῆς ἐπισταμένους^x—καὶ πῶς, εἶπον ἂν οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ διδασκάλῳ πάντως που ἀποκρινάμενοι, (that is, upon receiving the command to go and teach all nations,) τοῦθ' ἡμῖν ἔσται δυνατόν ; πῶς γὰρ Ῥωμαίοις, φέρε, κηρύξομεν ; πῶς δὲ Αἰγυπτίοις διαλεχθισόμεθα ; ποία δὲ χρησόμεθα λέξει πρὸς Ἑλληνας, ἄνδρες τῇ Σύρων ἐντραφέντες μόνη φωνῇ ; Πέρσας δὲ καὶ Ἀρμενίους καὶ Χαλδαίους καὶ Σκύθας καὶ Ἰνδοὺς, καὶ εἴ τινα βαρβάρων γένοιτο ἔθνη, πῶς πείσομεν ; κ', τ. λ.^y *.

The same writer tells us in his Ecclesiastical History, that the autographs of the letters, supposed to have passed between Christ and Abgarus, existed in the Syriac, (which we shall thus understand to mean the vernacular Hebrew,) in the archives of Edessa^z.

Jerome, in a great multitude of instances, takes for granted the existence of a vernacular Hebrew dialect, even in his own time, which he sometimes calls *Syriac* ; sometimes *Punic* : Lingua quoque Punica, quæ de Hebræorum fontibus manare dicitur, proprie virgo *alma* appellatur^a—Ipsa est quæ hodie Syro sermone

* So Chrysostom likewise, οἱ ἀπόστολοι ; ὁ μίαν γλῶτταν ἔχων Quod Christus sit Deus, Lib. i. 7. τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν, πῶς τὸν Σκύθην καὶ Operum i. 567. A. B. : καὶ πῶς τού- τὸν Ἰνδὸν καὶ τὸν Σαυρομάτην καὶ tous, φησὶν, ἅπαντας ἐπεσπάσαντο τὸν Θρᾶκα ἔπεισε ; κ', τ. λ.

^t Operum i. 528. A. iv. 34. ^u Demonstratio Evangelica, iii. 5. 112. C.
^x Ibid. 117. A. ^y Ibid. iii. 6. 136. A. ^z i. xiii. 32. A. B. 33. A. 35. B.
^a Operum iii. 71. ad principium, in Isai. vii.

vocatur *Zoora*, Hebræo *Segor*, utroque *parvula*^b—Alii . . . urbem Ostracinem intelligi volunt, et ceteras juxta Rhinocoruram et Casium civitates: quas usque hodie in Ægypto lingua Chananitide, hoc est Syra, loqui manifestum est: et putant e vicino Syros atque Arabas a Nabuchodonosor in illam terram fuisse translatos^c—Ergo et nos . . . non possumus loqui lingua Hebræa, sed lingua Chananitide, quæ inter Ægyptiam et Hebræam media est, et Hebrææ magna ex parte confinis^d—Quod enim Græce dicitur *χαῖρε*, et Latine *ave*; hoc Hebraico Syroque sermone appellatur *Salom lach*: sive *Salom emmach*, id est, *pax tecum**^e.

* In like manner, Ambrose, Operum i. 17. A. Hexaëmeron i. viii. 29. quoting the Syriac version of Genesis i. 2. observes: Denique Syrus, qui vicinus Hebræo est, et sermone consonat in plerisque et congruit, sic habet, &c. Thus too, Chrysostom, In Genesim Sermo ix. 3: Operum iv. 692. B: πολλή δὲ τῇ Σύρων φωνῇ πρὸς τὴν τῶν Ἑβραίων γλῶτταν ἡ συγγένεια: and speaking of the meaning of the word *Nôe*, he observes, Ibid. 5. 696. C. τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα Ἑβραϊκῇ λέγεται γλῶττει, καὶ ἐρμηνεύεται ὁ ἀναπαύων. τὸ γὰρ Νία τῇ Σύρων φωνῇ ἀνάπαυσίς ἐστιν.

Sozomen, E. H. v. xv. 617. B. explains the Syriac term Bethelia, the name of a village near Gaza, in his own time, to be the same with Θεῶν οἰκητήριον in Greek, like the ancient Bethel in Hebrew: and vii. xxix. 752. D. he tells us that the site of the tomb of the prophet Michaias, (Micaiah,) discovered, as he supposes, A. D.

394. near Eleutheropolis in Palestine, went among the people of the country, in their own language, by the name of νεφσαμμεμανᾶ, that is, μνήμα πιστὸν in Greek.

In the Greek anthology we meet with an epigram, in the shape of an epitaph supposed to be written and inscribed on the tomb of Meleager of Gadara; the two last lines of which specify the word Σελὸμ in Syriac, Αὔδονις in Punic or Phœnician, and Χαῖρε in Greek, as equivalent to each other. The epitaph is by Meleager on himself. Ἄλλ' εἰ μὲν Σύρος ἐστὶ, ΣΕΛΟΜ· εἰ δ' οὖν σύ γε Φοῖνιξ, | ΑΥΔΟΝΙΣ· εἰ δ' Ἕλλην, ΧΑΙΠΕ· τὸ δ' αὐτὸ φράσον. Anthologia, i. 38. Meleager, cxxvi.

Socrates informs us of Severianus of Gabala (a Syrian city) who flourished A. D. 400, contemporarily with Chrysostom, that with all his learning and eloquence, he never could master the pronunciation of Greek:

^b Operum iii. 118. *ad calcem*, in Is. xv. xx. ^d Ibid. 186. *ad calcem*, in Isai. xix. *in Matt. x.*

^c Ibid. 131. *ad principium*, in Isai. ^e Operum iv. Pars i^a. 36. *ad cal-*

Theodorit, Græcorum affectuum Curatio: ἡμεῖς δὲ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν καὶ προφητικῶν δογμάτων τὸ κράτος ἐναργῶς ἐπιδείκνυμεν. πᾶσα γὰρ ἡ ὑφήλιος τῶνδε τῶν λόγων ἀνάπλεως. καὶ ἡ Ἑβραίων φωνὴ οὐ μόνον εἰς τὴν Ἑλλήνων μετεβλήθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ῥωμαίων καὶ Αἰγυπτίων καὶ Περσῶν καὶ Ἰνδῶν καὶ Ἀρμενίων καὶ Σκυθῶν καὶ Σαυροματῶν, καὶ συλλήβδην εἰπεῖν, εἰς πάσας τὰς γλώττας αἷς ἅπαντα τὰ ἔθνη κεκρημένα διατελεῖ^f.

The same writer, explaining the word μαρاناθὰ, observes g, τοῦτο οὐ τῆς Ἑβραίας, ὥς τινες ὑπέλαβον, ἀλλὰ τῆς Σύρων ἐστὶ φωνῆς· ἐρμηνεύεται δὲ, ὁ Κύριος ἦλθε.

The Alexandrine mob called the poor buffoon, whom they dressed up in mockery of Herod Agrippa, as Philo Judæus tells us^h, by this name of Μάρις: οὕτως δὲ φασὶ τὸν κύριον ὀνομάζεσθαι παρὰ Σύροις. But they would not have so called him, in ridicule and contempt of Herod Agrippa, if the same word had not also been a vernacular Hebrew term.

Laurentius, De Mensibus, in an extract relating to the death of Julian, the emperor, tells us in like mannerⁱ, εἰς δὲ ἐκ τῆς Περσικῆς φάλαγγος, τῶν λεγομένων Σαρακηνῶν, ἐκ τῆς ἀλουργίδος βασιλέα ὑπολαβὼν, ἀνέκραγε πατρίως, Μαλχὰν, οἶονεῖ, βασιλεὺς *.

ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἑλληνιστὶ φθεγγόμενος, Σύρος ἦν τὴν φωνήν: E. H. vi. xi. 316. D. Cf. Sozomen, E. H. viii. x. 770. A. The history of the compositions of Bardesanes Syrus, and those of his son Harmonius, in the second and third century; and of those of Ephraim Syrus, a native of Nisibis, and inhabitant of Edessa, in the early part of the fourth century, is a clear proof of the distinctness of the Syriac from the Greek language, from the ear-

liest to the latest times. See Sozomen, E. H. iii. xvi. 525. A.—526. D. and Cf. Theodorit, E. H. iv. xxix. 192.

* Thus too, Eunapius, Vitæ Sophistarum, Πορφύριος, page 7, explains the original name of Porphyry, which was Malchus: Μάλχος δὲ κατὰ τὴν Σύρων πόλιν ὁ Πορφύριος ἐκαλεῖτο τὰ πρῶτα, (τοῦτο δὲ δύναται βασιλέα λέγειν) κ, τ. λ. Porphyry was born in Tyre.

^f Operum iv. 839. Disputatio v. Cf. ibid. 900. Disputatio viii. g iii. 285. In 1. ad Cor. xvi. 21. ^h Operum ii. 522. l. 47. Adversus Flaccum. ⁱ iv. 75.

It is recorded of Mithridates^k, that he spoke twenty-two different languages, as reigning over so many different nations. Yet his dominions embraced the principal parts of the East in which the Greeks were settled, and Grecian empires had been founded.

Strabo informs us that, according to some authorities, *seventy*, and according to others, *three hundred* different nations, inhabitants of mount Caucasus, all speaking a distinct language, were wont to meet and to trade together at Dioscurias on the Pontus^l. In the time of Pliny, also, though as a mart, it was considerably decayed, yet business was still transacted there by the help of one hundred and thirty interpreters; which implies as many distinct languages^m.

Strabo, de Mysis : μαρτυρεῖν δὲ καὶ τὴν διάλεκτον μιξολύδιον γὰρ πως εἶναι, καὶ μιξοφρύγιον—de Cibyratis : τέτταρσι δὲ γλώτταις ἐχρῶντο οἱ Κιβυράται, τῇ Πισιδικῇ, τῇ Σολύμων, τῇ Ἑλληνίδι, τῇ Λύδωνⁿ.

Xenophon, Ephesiaca^o: the Καππαδοκῶν φωνή, as such, is mentioned, as that of Lycaonia is, in the Acts, xiv. 11. In Hispania Bætica, though the native language was extinct in Strabo's time, yet it had been superseded not by the Greek, but by the Latin^p. In Phrygia, also, and the contiguous parts of Asia, there was still a native dialect^q; though the Latin language had done more to supersede it than the Greek*.

Gaul must have retained a language of its own, or

* The continued existence of the Phrygian, as a distinct language, as much as the Gothic, is recognised by Socrates, E. H. v. xxiii. 291. D. as late as A. D. 394. Cf. Ibid. 292. B: and also

Sozomen, E. H. vii. xvii. 730. C. Suidas, Εὐοῖ σαβοῖ, observes upon these words, that they were Phrygian, denoting in Greek τοὺς μύστας.

^k Valerius Max. viii. vii. 16. Pliny, H. N. vii. 24. xxv. 3. Auctor De Viris Illustribus, lxxvi. Quintilian, xi. ii. 50. Solinus, Polyhistor, cap. i. §. 109. Aulus Gellius, xvii. 17. ^l Strabo xi. 2. §. 16. 400. ^m Pliny, H. N. vi. 5. Yet it was still a place of note in Ammianus Marcellinus' time: see xxii. 8. 313. ⁿ xii. 7. §. 3. 204. xiii. 4. §. 17. 493. ^o iii. 254. ^p iii. 2. 404. ^q xii. 4. §. 6. 169.

Philostratus would not record it of Phavorinus^r, ὅθεν ὡς παράδοξα ἐπεχρησµῶδει τῷ ἑαυτοῦ βίῳ τρία ταῦτα, Γαλάτης ὢν Ἑλληνίζειν, κ', τ. λ. Irenæus speaks of it as existing in his own time^s. Jerome, Præf. lib. 2^{di} in Epistolam ad Galatas, observes, Massiliam Phocæi condiderunt: quos ait Varro trilingues esse, quod et Græce loquantur, et Latine et Gallice^t. And again, Unum est quod inferimus, et promissum in exordio reddimus, Galatas, excepto sermone Græco, quo omnis Oriens loquitur*, propriam linguam eandem pene habere quam Treviros, nec referre, si aliqua exinde corruperint; quum et Aphri Phœnicum linguam, nonnulla ex parte mutaverint, et ipsa Latinitas et regionibus quotidie mutetur et tempore^{†u}.

Corsica, in like manner, had its own dialect when Seneca was in banishment there; Cogita . . quam non facile Latina ei verba homini succurrant, quem barba-

* That is, not so as to supersede every other language in the East, but so as to be understood and spoken, more or less, even where other languages might be spoken too, and perhaps better understood.

† Apuleius, De Magia Oratio, ii. 102. bears witness that the Punic dialect had been superseded in parts of Africa at least, neither by the Greek nor by the Latin. This oration was pronounced in the reign of Antoninus Pius. The Latin, Greek, and Punic are mentioned in the Epitome of Aurelius Victor, De Severo, as contemporary languages, yet distinct from each other: Latinis litteris sufficienter instructus.

Græcis sermonibus eruditus. Punicæ eloquentiæ promptior, quippe genitus apud Leptim provinciæ Africae. There is a well known anecdote of Augustin's, which relates how his father having accidentally overheard the conversation of two Carthaginian peasants, was forcibly struck by the pronunciation of the word for *three* in that language, resembling *salus* in Latin, as the corresponding word in the Hebrew really does. Procopius, too, (De Bello Vandalico, ii. 10.) testifies to the continued existence of the same language among the Maurusii or Moors of his own time; which was the reign of Justinian, A. D. 527. and upwards.

^r Vitæ Sophistarum, i. 493. D. Phavorinus. ad Lib. i. ^t Operum iv. pars i. 253, 254,

^s Opera, 3, l. 23—25. Præfatio

^u Ibid. 255, 256.

rorum inconditus et barbaris quoque humanioribus gravis fremitus circumsonet^x.

The Greek language in many instances, so far from superseding the native or aboriginal dialects, had fallen a victim to their predominance, and become extinct. Athenæus mentions an example of this change in the case of the settlers at Posidonium, or Pæstum, in Italy: from Aristoxenus, ἐν τοῖς Συμμικτοῖς Συμποτικοῖς^y. Dionysius Halicarnassensis observes, ἐπεὶ ἄλλοι γε συχνοὶ (τῶν Ἑλλήνων) ἐν βαρβάροις οἰκοῦντες, ὀλίγου χρόνου διελθόντος, ἅπαν τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἀπέμαθον, ὥς μήτε φωνὴν Ἑλλάδα φθέγγεσθαι, μήτε ἐπιτηδεύμασιν Ἑλλήνων ἔτι χρῆσθαι, μήτε θεοὺς τοὺς αὐτοὺς νομίζειν, μήτε νόμους τοὺς ἐπικεῖς, ᾧ μάλιστα διαλλάσσει φύσις Ἑλλὰς βαρβάρου, μήτε τῶν ἄλλων συμβολαίων (μηδ' ὃ τιεῖσιν.) And he cites the instance of the Achæans, settled in the neighbourhood of the Pontus, ὅλον μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Ἑλληνικωτάτου γένόμενοι, βαρβάρων δὲ συμπάντων νῦν (ὄντων) ἀγριώτατοι^z *.

Ovid says the same of the people of Tomos, also on the Pontus, though Greeks originally; and of himself who had lived so long among them.

Nesciaque est vocis quod barbara lingua Latinæ;

Grajaque quod Getico victa loquela sono.

Tristium v. ii. 67.

* The sophist Himerius, Opera, 480. Oratio v. 6. observes of the city of Thessalonica in Macedonia, in his own time (the reign of Julian more particularly): πρέπει (δὲ) ταύτῃ τῆς τε ἄλλης ἀρετῆς εἵνεκα, ἀτὰρ οὐχ ἥκιστα τῆς σπουδῆς ἥν ἐπὶ σοφία παρέχεται, μέση ἐν μέσοις κειμένη μικροῦ πᾶσιν ὡς ἐν κύκλῳ, τοῖς τὴν

φωνὴν βαρβαρίζουσιν. Of this number he reckons up the Pæonians, Illyrians, Mæsiensians, Thracians: in the midst of whom, says he, the city itself, μόνη καθάπερ τινὰ χρυσοῦν ὀμφαλὸν τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶτταν ἀνέχουσα, καθαρὰν ταύτην φυλάττει τῆς ἐπιμιξίας τῆς γείτονος.

^x Operum i. Ad Polybium, xxxvii. 7. *ad fin.* ^y xiv. 31.

^z Ant. Rom.

i. 89. 231. l. 8. Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus, xxii. 8. 313.

In paucis remanent Graejæ vestigia linguæ :

Hæc quoque jam Getico barbara facta sono.

Ullus in hoc vix est populo, qui forte Latine

Quælibet e medio reddere verba queat.

Ibid. v. vii. 51.

And this being the case, we shall know what allowance to make for the rhetorical flourish of Aristides, where he is complimenting the Athenians on the universal prevalence of the Attic dialect^a: *παᾶσαν τὴν γῆν τύχη τινὶ θεῖᾳ ζῆλος ἐπέρχεται τῆς ὑμετέρας σοφίας καὶ συνηθείας, καὶ ταύτην μίαν φωνὴν κοινὴν ἅπαντες τοῦ γένους ἐνόμισαν, καὶ δι' ὑμῶν ὁμόφωνος μὲν πᾶσα γέγονεν ἡ οἰκουμένη, ἴδοις δ' ἂν καὶ τοὺς ἡνιόχους, καὶ τοὺς νομέας, καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάττης ζῶντας, καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἔθνη, καὶ κατὰ πόλεις καὶ κατὰ χώρας, τῆς παρ' ὑμῶν φωνῆς ἐχομένους, καὶ πειρωμένους τῆς γῆς ἀνθάπτεσθαι, καθάπερ τοὺς νεῖν ἀδυνάτους.*

It was, however, in the East, as such; in Egypt, Syria, and Upper Asia; that the aboriginal or native dialects had maintained themselves most securely, against the encroachments of any foreign and exotic language. The existence of the native dialect in Egypt, in his time, is implicitly attested by Aristides^b*. Ammianus Marcellinus observes upon the names of the cities founded by Seleucus *quarum ad præsens pleræque licet Græcis nominibus appellentur, quæ iis-*

* Philostorgius, E. H. iii. 6. 479. A. asserts that a colony of Syrians, planted by Alexander the Great (about B. C. 332.) on the borders of Egypt and Ethiopia, retained their original language in his own time, the end of the fourth century. The Hieroglyphica of Horapollon were written in the native language of Egypt, and translated into

the present Greek, by one Philip; though the writer himself, Horapollon, according to Suidas, flourished only ἐπὶ Θεοδοσίου. Vide the short title prefixed to the work. Egyptian words occur in it repeatedly. The continued existence of the native Egyptian is attested by Porphyry, De Abstinence, iv. 9. 324, 325. iv. 10. 329.

^a Oratio xiii. 294. 15.

^b Oratio xlviii. Αἰγύπτιος, 443. line 14.

dem ad arbitrium imposita sunt conditoris, primogenia tamen nomina non amittunt, quæ eis Assyria lingua institutores veteres indiderunt^c. The story which Plutarch records, of what happened in the court of Parthia, after the death of Crassus, and at the time of the theatrical representations which were going on when the news of that event was brought there, or instituted because of it, is a proof that the knowledge of Greek was no common accomplishment in Armenia or Parthia^{d*}. He speaks also of the Parthian and Syriac languages as such, in his Life of Antony^e. Longinus was Zenobia's instructor in Greek; yet Syriac was the court or state language of Palmyra, in which all official communications were made^f: and according to Euphronius, the purest dialect in Syria was the Palmyrene^g. The disputation of Archelaus and Manes, held about A. D. 276, was written originally in the Syriac^{h†}. Archelaus in one part of it addresses his adversary in these terms: Persa barbære, non Græcorum linguæ, non Ægyptiorum, non Romanorum, non ullius alterius linguæ scientiam habere potuisti; sed Chaldæorum solum, quæ ne in numerum quidem aliquem ducitur; nullum alium loquentem audire potesⁱ.

Philostratus, in his Life of Apollonius of Tyana, supposes his hero endued with the gift of tongues^k:

* Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus, xviii. 5. and Procopius, De Bello Persico, ii. 2. and De Bello Gotthico, iii. 26. We might add, that Latin was as little understood in the same quarters. *τίνα γὰρ ἔσεσθαι συμφωνίαν ἐν αὐτοῖς, μήτε τῆς ἀλλήλων φωνῆς συνιῆσιν, κ'. τ. λ.* was the answer returned

by the Parthian king Artabanus, A. D. 216 or 217. to the proposal of the Roman emperor Antoninus (Caracalla) to marry his daughter. Herodian, iv. 19.

† Archelaus was bishop of Caschara, a city of Mesopotamia. Socrates, E. H. i. xxii. 56. D.

^c xiv. 8. 42. ^d Crassus, 32. 33.
^g Operum i. 629. C. Manichæi, xlii.
De SS. Ecclesiasticis, lxxii. ⁱ Cap. 36: Reliquiæ Sacræ, iv. 224. ^k i. 13. p. 25. A. B.

^e Cap. 46. ^f Vopiscus, Aurelianus, 30.

^h Jerome, Operum iv. Pars ii^a. 120.

καὶ μὴν καὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν βαρβάρων ὁπόσαι εἰσὶν· εἰσὶ δὲ ἄλλη μὲν Ἀρμενίων, ἄλλη δὲ Μήδων τε καὶ Περσῶν, ἄλλη δὲ Καδουσίῳν· μεταλαμβάνω πάσας. He makes him put this question to Bardanes, king of Parthia : ὦ βασιλεῦ, ἔφη, τὴν φωνὴν τὴν Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν γινώσκεις, ἢ σμικρὰ αὐτῆς; . . πᾶσαν, εἶπεν, ἴσα τῇ ἐγχωρίῳ ταύτῃ¹. Aristides also implies that a king of Parthia would not necessarily be able to speak Greek, where he observes in his *ἱεροὶ λόγοι*, in an account of one of his dreams, *προσιόντων δὲ τῶν περὶ τὸν Βολόγεσον, φωνὴν εἶναι οὐκ ὀλίγην, καὶ δοκεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐλληνίζειν*^m. Dio Chrysostom, in like manner, enumerates the Phœnician as one of the principal languages, along with the Persian, Greek, or Syrian : καὶ νομίζουσι τὸν πλείστα γράμματα εἰδότα Περσικά τε καὶ Ἑλληνικά καὶ τὰ Σύρων καὶ τὰ Φοινίκων . . . τοῦτον σοφώτατον—ὥσπερ οἱ δύο ἢ τρία Περσικά εἰδότες ῥήματα ἢ Μηδικὰ ἢ Ἀσσύρια, τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας ἐξαπατῶσινⁿ *.

Josephus tells us of an occasion when Titus addressed the people of the Jews by an interpreter, which he says was a mark of superiority^o: and so it might be, if it is thereby implied that he spoke to them in Latin. But it by no means follows, that the use of this interpreter was to translate Latin into Greek, for their better understanding of it; and not into Hebrew, or the native language of the country. Paulus Æmiliius addressed the conquered Macedonians by an interpreter likewise^p, in order, as we are told expressly, to

* Ælian, *De Natura Animalium*, v. 51 : ὁ γοῦν Σκύθης ἄλλως φθέγγεται, καὶ ὁ Ἰνδὸς ἄλλως, καὶ ὁ Αἰθίοψ ἔχει φωνὴν συμφυῆ, καὶ οἱ Σάκαι, φωνὴ δὲ Ἑλλὰς ἄλλη, καὶ Ῥωμαία ἄλλη, κ', τ. λ. Porphyry, *Περὶ ἀποχῆς ζώων*, iii. 3. 218, 219. re-

cognises the Indian, Scythian, Thracian, Syrian, and Persian, as current languages in his own time, (the latter half of the third century,) just as much as the Greek.

¹ i. 20. pag. 43. A.
^o De Bello, vi. vi. 2.

^m i. xxiii. 454. 4.
^p Livy, xlv. 29.

ⁿ Oratio iv. 151. 35 : x. 304. 24.

translate what he himself spoke in Latin, intelligibly to them in Greek. Constantine addressed the assembled bishops, at the opening of the council of Nice, in Latin, translated by an interpreter^q*; though both he was able to speak Greek, and they all understood it. But Latin was the court or state language, and the medium of communication on all great occasions †.

* It is an observation of Chrysostom's, *Operum* vii. 756. D. *Homilia in Matt. lxxviii. 4*: *καθάπερ γὰρ ὅταν Ῥωμαῖος ὦν ὁ κριτὴς τύχη, οὐκ ἀκούσεται ἀπολογουμένου τοῦ οὐκ εἰδότες οὕτω φθέγγεσθαι, &c., τ. λ.*

† The Latin language, under any circumstances, would be more agreeable to a Roman ear than the Greek. Tiberius forbad the use of Greek in public discussions, or public documents. Juvenal tells his friend, whom he had invited to dine with him, that if he had occasion to call his servant, he must do it in Latin: for he had not been taught Greek. *Cum posces, posce Latine.* xi. 148. And Ovid, while he supposes the knowledge of both languages, gives the preference to the Latin: *Sive tamen Graja scierit, sive ille Latina | Voce loqui; certe gratior hujus erit.* *Tristium* iii. xii. 39.

The knowledge of Latin, as was natural—(that being the language of the lords and masters of the greatest part of mankind—) was become in the time of Plutarch almost an universal accomplishment: *ὥς δοκεῖ μοι περὶ Ῥωμαίων λέγειν, ὧν μὲν λόγῳ νῦν ὁμοῦ τι πάντες ἄνθρωποι χρῶνται.* *Platonicae quæstiones, Operum* x. 198.

Constantine's circular letter addressed to each of the provinces of the empire, after the defeat of Licinius, A. D. 323. was written in Greek and Latin: Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, ii. xxiii. 454. D. Cf. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, ii. xxiii. et quæ sequuntur: ii. xlvii. 466: iv. xix. and xx. 535. B. C: xxxii. 541. D: xxxv. 543. C.

Socrates, E. H. ii. xx. 101. B. tells us the western bishops did not understand Greek, or at least not so well as Latin; which was one reason why they rejected the formulary of faith set forth by the second council of Antioch, (about A. D. 345. see cap. xix. just before,) and got together the council of Sardica, A. D. 347. to draw up another for themselves. Cf. also, *ibid.* xxx. 121. D. of the proceedings of the synod of Sirminium, A. D. 351: and 126. B. of Photinus' double edition of the same work, in Greek and Latin respectively.

Eunapius, *Vitæ Sophistarum*, 101. Nymphidianus, mentions that the emperor Julian appointed the sophist Nymphidianus his Greek secretary: *ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς ἐπιστήσας, ὅσαι διὰ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἐρμηνεύονται λόγων*: the proper inference from which words is, that the Greek epistles

^q Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, iii. 12. 13.

From the immense extent of the Roman dominions, and the variety of persons or causes which might come before Roman magistrates, an interpreter was a necessary appendage of their office. Pliny, speaking of Trajan's second consulship, and of his having to give audience to people of all countries and languages, writes thus^r: *Augebant majestatem præsidentis diversi postulantium habitus, ac dissonæ voces, raraque sine interprete oratio.* Otherwise the use of an interpreter, in a given instance, proves nothing, except that one or each of the parties for whom he is required, is ignorant of the other's language. The address of Tiridates to Nero, U. C. 819. was translated to the people present by an interpreter^s; and therefore, we may presume was delivered by Tiridates in Parthian.

I do not think any good argument, to shew the prevalence of the Greek language in Judæa, can be derived from the frequent mention in Josephus of *πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες* as such. These cities are comparatively few

in question were versions of a certain part of the imperial correspondence; which consequently must have been carried on generally in some other language (doubtless the Latin) though part of it required to be turned into Greek. Sozomen, too, E. H. ix. i. 800. A. B. enumerates it particularly among the other accomplishments of Pulcheria, the sister of Theodosius the younger, at the time of her father's death (Arcadius) A. D. 408. that she was able to speak and write both Greek and Latin with equal fluency.

Chrysostom has an observation in his IV. Homily on the Second to Timothy, chap. ii. §. 3.

which illustrates the contempt entertained by many of the Romans of any language but their own. "Paul," says he, "was a Cilician. He knew no language but the Hebrew, the most universally held in contempt by all, especially by the Italians. No form of speech, either among Greeks or the Barbarians, is so little esteemed by them as the Syriac; to which the Hebrew is very nearly akin. For if many of them," he continues, "profess to despise so wonderful and beautiful a language as the Greek, how much more the Hebrew." *Operum* xi. 682. E. F.

^r Panegyricus, 56. §. 6.

^s Suetonius, Nero, 13.

in number ; and in every instance they were situated on the sea coast, in the way of trade and commerce, (the very reverse of the Jewish, see *Contra Apionem*, i. 12.), or on the confines of Judæa and the neighbouring regions, Syria or Egypt. They are such as Gaza, Azotus, Ascalon, Cæsarea, Hippus, Gadara, (cf. *Ant. Jud.* xiii. xv. 4.) &c. the inhabitants of which were either all, or by far the greater part of them, properly Gentiles ; as much distinguished from the native Jews in religion and manners, as they probably were in language. Greek was very likely to be spoken in all these places : but though we were to admit this to the fullest extent, it would prove nothing of the rest of the country ; Judæa Proper, Idumæa, Samaria, Galilee, and Peræa. The language spoken in twenty or thirty places ; peculiarly situated as these were, and peopled by a mixed or mongrel race ; can prove nothing of the great body of the people, the pure and unadulterated stock of the Jews, who were dispersed in the thousand towns and villages which Palestine is said to have contained. These were occupied by millions of souls, proverbially tenacious of old usages, and averse to change or innovation ; and who at this period of their history were notorious for nothing so much as a rooted antipathy to every thing Gentile ; an antipathy which would extend to the languages of the Gentiles, as well as to any other peculiarity of theirs ; and among these languages, to that in particular which was the most generally diffused of all, and the most distinctive of a Gentile as such—viz. the Greek. Cf. on this subject, Mr. Biscoe's *Dissertations on the Acts* ; cap. iv.

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION IV.

On the reigns and succession of the Maccabæan princes.

Vide Dissertation v. vol. i. 248. Article iii.

IN the details of the hundred and twenty-six years, which Josephus assigns to the Asmonæan Dynasty, he has implicitly followed the first of Maccabees; so much so, as in many instances to copy its expressions. The notices of time, supplied by this book, are numerous: nor between them and the accounts of Josephus is there any material difference, except what concerns the alleged time of the death of Judas Maccabæus; which the former place *before*, and the latter *after*, the death of the high-priest Alcimus. But this is a discrepancy which affects only the subdivisions of the period in question. In the general outline both our authorities are agreed; and, as far as they proceed in common, the succession of the Asmonæan or Maccabæan princes may be thus exhibited:

	Æræ Sel.	B. C.
Antiochus Eupator makes peace with Judas Maccabæus ^a .	150.	163—162.
Jonathan the brother of Judas, assumes the high-priesthood at the feast of Tabernacles ^b .	160.	153—152.
He dies in the winter season ^c .	—	— —
Simon, his brother, is confirmed by Demetrius ^d .	170.	143—142.
He is assassinated in the spring ^e .	177.	136—135.

^a 1 Macc. vi. 16. 20—61. ^b x. 21. ^c xiii. 22, 23. ^d xiii. 41. Jos. De Bell. i. i. 2. ^e 1 Macc. xvi. 14—17. Jos. Ant. Jud. xiii. vii. 4.

The history of the first of Maccabees expires with this event; but the narrative is continued by Josephus as follows:

	B. C.
The first year of John Hyrcanus, as dated from the death of his father Simon, must be dated from the spring.	135.
His son, Aristobulus I. began to reign ^f .	102.
The brother of this Aristobulus, Alexander Jannæus, began to reign ^g .	102.
His wife, Queen Alexandra, began to reign ^h .	75.

Upon these statements I have to make the following observations.

The length of the reign of Hyrcanus, which bears date from the time of his father's death, viz. the *eleventh* month in the Jewish year, that is, from the spring, B. C. 135. was thirty-three years in all. The duration of thirty years, assigned to it by Josephus elsewhereⁱ, must be dated from his accession to the high-priesthood, B. C. 132*. The years of his reign were *full* years: beginning and ending with the spring; for his father died in the spring; and his son Aristobulus, who assumed the diadem three months *after* a feast of the Passover, or *before* a feast of Tabernacles^k, must have come to the throne in the spring. And as Aristobulus reigned only until some little time after the feast of Tabernacles in question, Jannæus would necessarily succeed him in the course of the same year. Jannæus also must have died about the middle or the end of some year; for he is said to have

* Hyrcanus' accession to the high-priesthood might be considered in one sense, the first of his reign. Ant. Jud. xiii. viii. 2. also, Olymp. 162, is said to synchronize with the first of Hyrcanus. Olymp. 162. 1. answers to B. C. 132.

^f Ant. Jud. xiii. x. 7. xi. 1. De Bell. i. ii. 8. ^g Ibid. xiii. xi. 1. 3. xii. 1. De Bell. i. iii. 1—6. iv. 1. ^h Ibid. xiii. xv. 5. De Bell. i. iv. 8: v. 1. ⁱ Ant. xx. x. ^k Ibid. xiii. xi. 1. De Bell. i. iii. 1. 2.

reigned twenty-seven years^k; and he died either during, or just after, the season of military operations in his last year. If he reigned twenty-seven years *complete*, this would be some time towards the end of B. C. 75; if twenty-seven years current only, it might be about the same time B. C. 76. His successor queen Alexandra, at least, (who is said to have reigned nine years in all^l), could not have been alive later than the beginning of B. C. 66; for the capture of Jerusalem, on the tenth of Tisri, B. C. 63, is indissolubly fixed to the *fourth* year current after her death. That she died either B. C. 67. *exeunte*, or B. C. 66. *ineunte*, may be collected from the mention of military operations, so soon after her decease^m, if not from the allusion to the passoverⁿ; which might be the first after that event. I conclude, then, that the reigns of Jannæus and of Alexandra in succession occupied, both together, the intermediate period from B. C. 102. *ab auctumno* to B. C. 66. *ineuntem*; a period of thirty-five years, and about four months, in all; which was probably so distributed between them, that twenty-six years and the odd months belonged to Jannæus, and the remaining nine to Alexandra. To proceed, then, with the details of the account as before.

The statement^o that Hyrcanus the Second, the son of this Alexandra, entered on the high-priesthood, *Olym.* 177. 3. *Coss. Q. Hortensio, et Q. Cæcilio Metello Cretico*, U. C. 685, (though both these notes of time may correspond with each other, and with B. C. 69.) must still be understood with a certain latitude; viz. of some appointment in that year (if at all) *before* his mother's death, not of any appointment *after* it. I cannot help suspecting, however, some in-

^k Ant. xiii. xv. 5. De Bello, i. iv. 8.

^l Ant. xiii. xvi. 6. De Bello, i. v. 4.

^m Ant. xiv. i. 2. De Bello, i. vi. 1, 2.

ⁿ Ant. xiv. ii. 1, 2.

^o xiv. i. 2.

accuracy in the statement itself. It is repeatedly asserted elsewhere that Hyrcanus was high-priest during the whole of his mother's reign^p; which began long before B.C. 69: and we saw in Dissertation v. vol. i. page 261. that between B. C. 37. U.C. 717. and his original or primary appointment to that office, forty current years (which, however, were one or two years in excess) were supposed to have elapsed. This would date his appointment as far back as B. C. 75 or 76.

The true date, then, of Hyrcanus's accession to the priesthood, as such, *before* his mother's death, was B. C. 75; that of his accession to the throne along with the priesthood *after* her death^q, was B. C. 66. The mistatement of Josephus I conjecture to have been produced by forgetting that Hyrcanus was simply reinstated, B.C. 63, four current years *after* his mother's death; and not originally appointed, B. C. 69. four current years *before* it.

There is no difficulty as to what remains. As the first accession of Hyrcanus is to be dated about the passover^r, B. C. 66, so his second appointment, on the dispossession of Aristobulus the younger, is to be dated from the tenth of Tisri, B. C. 63^s. From this time to the second capture of Jerusalem by Herod and Sosius, U.C. 717. B.C. 37. there were twenty-six years complete*; of which the first twenty-three, viz. from B. C. 63. to B. C. 40. will belong to Hyrcanus, before his *second*

* Josephus calls this interval one of twenty-seven years, κζ'. εἴτη—a number, however, which might easily be substituted in his text for κς'. εἴτη. Syncellus, quoting from the fourteenth book of the Antiquities, i. 580, line 8. has κς'. also. But this cannot be the true reading, unless, by a lapse

of memory, Josephus dated from the Passover, instead of the Feast of Tabernacles, B. C. 63: in which case, there would be twenty-seven current years from that date to the Feast of Tabernacles, B. C. 37. Vide Ant. Jud. xiv. xvi. 4.

^p Ant. xiii. xvi. 2: xv. vi. 4: xx. x: De Bello, i. v. 1. ^q Ant. Jud. xiv. i. 2. De Bello, i. vi. 1. ^r Ant. xiv. ii. 1, 2. ^s Ibid. iv. 3, 4.

dispossession ; and the remainder, from B. C. 40. to B. C. 37. will belong to Antigonus the son of Aristobulus, before the extinction of the Asmonæan Dynasty. Vide the places noted in the margin ^t.

^t Ant. Jud. xx. x. xiv. vi. 1 : xiii. 3,

APPENDIX.

4

DISSERTATION V.

On the time of the admission of Caius Cæsar to the Councils of Augustus.

Vide Dissertation v. vol. i. page 281. last line.

AMONG those who were present at the council when Augustus decided on the will of Herod, both in the Antiquities of Josephus, and in the War, Caius Cæsar is particularly mentioned^a. The privilege of being present at the public councils, after a certain age, was conceded by Augustus to the sons of senators generally^b. In the case of his two adopted sons, Caius and Lucius Cæsar, the Ancyran monument informs us^c, *Honoris mei causa senatus populusque Romanus annum quintum et decimum agentes consules (eos) designavit, ut eum magistratum inirent post quinquennium, et ex eo die quo deducti sunt in forum ut interessent consiliis publicis decrevit senatus.*

Caius Cæsar was born U. C. 734^d; and very probably in the latter half of that year: for Agrippa his father was not married to Julia until after his return from Asia the year before. He would, consequently, be in his *fifteenth* year about the usual time of holding the consular comitia, U. C. 748: and if he was designed consul at that time, when he had just completed his fourteenth, or had just entered on his fifteenth year, the testimony of the Ancyran marble would be consistent with that of the Marmor, quoted by cardinal

^a Ant. xvii. ix. 5. De Bello, ii. ii. 4. ^b Dio, lvi. 17. Suetonius, Augustus, 38.
^c Apud Tacitum, iv. 841. ^d Dio, liv. 8.

Norisius, *De Cenotaphiis Pisanis*^e. He appears, accordingly, in the Fasti, as consul *ordinarius*, U. C. 754: that is, *in the sixth year after the year of his designation, exclusive*.

From this time forward, the presence of Caius, as the elder of Augustus' two adopted sons, as heir apparent of the empire, and as consul elect—at all deliberations of any importance, might naturally be expected. Yet it is seen from Dio^f that even after this time, Augustus had so much reason to be dissatisfied with the young prince's conduct, as purposely to keep him back from many distinctions, to which he would otherwise have been admitted.

It is implied in Dio^g, that Augustus admitted Caius Cæsar εἰς τὴν ἐς τὸ συνέδριον συμφοίτησιν as early as U. C. 748: and it may appear to be implied in Josephus that the *first* occasion, on which he actually exercised this privilege, was the very occasion when Augustus held a council upon the will of Herod. But the language of Josephus in each instance^h is at least ambiguous, if not positively liable to misconstruction. According to both passages, and more especially to that in the Antiquities, the true account of his meaning appears to me to be, not that this was the first time when Caius had been admitted to such deliberations as these; but that he presided in the present instance along with Augustus; he took the chief seat next to him: which rather implies that he had been admitted to such consultations already. To suppose, indeed, that Caius was present at the public councils, upon this occasion, for the first time, and, consequently, that the question of the will of Herod was actually under discussion before Augustus, U. C. 748. or even, U. C. 749. would be utterly irreconcilable to any date of his death,

^e Dissertatio ii. cap. 3. Cf. Dio, lv. 9. ^f lv. 9. ^g Loco cit. Cf. Zonaras x. 35. 539. A. ^h Locis citatis.

however early, that could be proposed with the least degree of probability in its favour.

The Ancyran monument, as we have seen, dates the admission both of Caius and Lucius Cæsar to the public consultations, *Ex eo die quo deducti sunt in forum*: that is, from the time when they laid aside the toga *puerilis* or *prætexta*, and put on the toga *pura*, *libera*, or *virilis*. The age at which young men commonly underwent this ceremony was originally sixteen or seventeen ⁱ. Towards the end of the commonwealth, and thenceforward, however, the rule became different, and the toga *virilis* was commonly assumed in the fourteenth or fifteenth year ^k. More particularly was this the rule observed in the case of persons of quality. Antyllus, Antony's and Fulvia's eldest son, was born U. C. 710, and assumed the toga *virilis* U. C. 724 ^l. Nero, Germanicus' eldest son, was born U. C. 760, and assumed the toga *virilis* U. C. 773 ^m. *Virilis toga Neroni maturata*, says Tacitus ⁿ: that is, he was allowed to assume it earlier than usual; viz. in his fourteenth year, *ineunte*, U. C. 804. *ineunte* *. The history of

* According to Dio, lxi. 3. and Suetonius, Vita, 6. Nero was born U. C. 790. in the month of December. Tacitus also, Ann. xiii. 6. speaks of him as being *Vix septemdecim annos egressus*, U. C. 807. *exeunte*: and xii. 58. he is said to have been sixteen, U. C. 806. *ineunte*; which may be understood of fifteen complete—or sixteen incomplete. Yet Tacitus is not always con-

sistent in speaking of the age of Nero. Ann. xii. 25. U. C. 803. *ineunte*—he is said to have been only two years older than Britannicus, who was born, according to Dio, lx. 12. 10. and Suetonius, Claudius, 27. in the spring, or on Feb. 12, U. C. 795. Tacitus, indeed, from what he mentions Ann. xiii. 15. U. C. 808. may have thought that Britannicus was born a year earlier;

i Vide Macrobius, i. 6: Aulus Gellius, x. 28: Plutarch, C. Gracchus, 5: Servius, ad Æneidem, vii. 162: Seneca, De Beneficiis, iii. xxxiii. 1: Livy, xxi. 46: Valerius Max. v. iv. 2: Servius, ad Æneidem, x. 800: Valerius Max. iii. i. 1: Echkel, de Doctrina Numm. Vett. v. 71: Servius, ad Æneidem, ix. 590: Livy, xxii. 57: xlv. 40: Plutarch, Cato Minor, 3. 73: Valerius Max. iii. i. 2. ^k Cicero, Epp. ad Atticum, i. 2: ix. 19: Cf. Donatus' Life of Virgil: Nicolaus Damascenus, Vita Aug. Cæs. pag. 90. cap. 4: Seneca, Ad Marciam, xxiv. 1: Statius, Silvarum v. ii. 12. 64. seqq. ^l Plutarch, Antonius, 10. 71. ^m Tacitus, Ann. iii. 29: Suetonius, Caius, 7. 8. ⁿ Annales, xii. 41.

the later emperors, as of Marcus Antoninus the philosopher, of Commodus, Caracalla, &c. would still shew, if it were necessary, the observance of the rule in question.

The time of the year when the ceremony of discarding the *toga prætexta*, and of the *deductio in forum*, was undergone, generally speaking, was the spring; viz. at the feast of Bacchus, or the Liberalia, xvi. Kal. Apriles, March 17.

Restat, ut inveniam, quare toga libera detur

Lucifero pueris, candide Bacche, tuo.

Ovid, *Fasti*, iii. 771.

Ergo ut tironem celebrare frequentia possit,

Visa dies dandæ non aliena togæⁿ.

Ibid. 787.

And this may perhaps be considered the reason why the ceremony in question, according to the old usage, took place sometimes in the sixteenth, and sometimes in the seventeenth year; according to the new, sometimes in the fourteenth, sometimes in the fifteenth: viz. as the birthday of the individual happened to fall out nearer to or further from the Liberalia in question.

We may take it for granted that the case of Caius and Lucius Cæsar would not be an exception to the general rule; in other words, that each of them would assume the manly gown in his fourteenth or his fifteenth year. And, indeed, Suetonius informs us^o, that Augustus' only reason for accepting his twelfth and his thirteenth consulships respectively, was that he might reflect so much the more lustre on the ceremony of the tirocinium, or *deductio in forum* of his two sons—that of Caius in the first instance, U.C. 749:

viz. in the spring of U. C. 794.
But even this will suppose Nero
to have been born a year later

than the truth at least—U. C.
791. *exeunte*, not U. C. 790.

ⁿ Cf. Cicero, *Epp. ad Atticum*, vi. 1.

^o Augustus, 26.

and that of Lucius in the second, U. C. 752*. If the one was born, after the Liberalia, U. C. 734. and the other^p after the Liberalia, U. C. 737. this would be, in each instance, while the fifteenth year of their age was still current.

The anniversary of the Liberalia had not perhaps been three months passed, when Archelaus arrived at Rome; and Lucius Cæsar had probably by the same time entered on his fifteenth year. Hence, as the consultation in question upon the will of Herod, was not strictly a *public* one, it is not unlikely that Augustus might admit Lucius Cæsar to it; in which case, it would also not be unlikely that this admission of him was for the first time. If any one, therefore, is disposed to put such a construction on the words of Josephus, that whichever of the two, whether Lucius or Caius, was present on this occasion, he was present for the first time; it would be an obvious conjecture that by a lapse of memory, not at all uncommon in him, he has confounded Caius with Lucius.

But I am persuaded that the other construction is his true meaning in each instance; and the ancient author of the Latin version understood both passages in the same sense: so that there is no just ground for questioning the accuracy of Josephus, either in the Antiquities or in the War, with respect to this statement at least. Lucius Cæsar, we perceive, is not mentioned by him, in reference to the present occasion, at all; and there is no reason to suppose that he would be. He did not become privileged to attend his father's councils, or those of the senate, until the en-

* Zonaras, x. 35. 539. A. agrees with Suetonius in the year of the deductio of Caius, but makes that of Lucius take place the year after. But this is probably a mistake.

suing year, U.C. 752: and hence, as we may observe by the way, is derived a strong objection to the opinion which places the death of Herod, U.C. 752; viz. that though by this year Lucius Cæsar would have been as much entitled to sit in judgment on his will, as his brother Caius, the latter only is actually spoken of as exercising that privilege. There is no doubt that as Lucius was entirely upon a par with his brother, both in the affections of Augustus, and in the rights and distinctions belonging to their community of rank, and their personal relation to the emperor; he would have been admitted to the exercise of this privilege as well as his brother, had his age entitled him to be so.

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION VI.

On the date of the Marriage of Archelaus and Glaphyra.

Vide Dissertation v. vol. i. page 281. last line.

A FACT, in the history of Archelaus, is mentioned by Josephus^a, to which sufficient attention has not been paid, in determining the year of his banishment—and consequently, of his father's death. And yet the fact is one which from its very nature may be implicitly relied upon as true; and it is as well adapted as any that could be advanced, for the disproof of the assertion of Dio in particular, that Archelaus was deposed and banished, U. C. 759.

The fact in question is this. After the death of Alexander, Archelaus' brother, his widow Glaphyra was married to Juba king of Lybia, or Mauritania; and after the death of Juba, she was again married to Archelaus: with whom, however, she had not been living long, when she had a remarkable dream, which was followed in two days' time by her death.

There can be no doubt that the Juba here mentioned was the second king of Mauritania of that name; a contemporary of Augustus Cæsar's, and better known to posterity for the number and variety of his accomplishments as a writer, than even for his noble birth and princely fortune. To modern times, however, nothing more of his has descended, than the mere titles of some of his many works, and a few fragments in the shape of quotations from others,

^a Ant. Jud. xvii. xiii. 4. De Bello, ii. vii. 4.

which are too meagre and scanty to reward a collector, who should be at the trouble of bringing them together. Nor am I aware that among these references to his works, there are any on record, which would supply the necessary data for determining the year of his death. Philostratus quotes him ^b, as relating that he had caught an elephant, four hundred years after some battle—the time of which, however, is not specified: and Basil of Cappadocia seems to refer to the same statement, where he observes ^c, *νῦν δὲ ἥδη τινὲς ἱστοροῦσι καὶ τριακόσια ἔτη καὶ πλείω τούτων βιοῦν τὸν ἐλέφαντα* *.

Repeated allusions occur in the Natural History of Pliny to a work of Juba's, upon Arabia, which he dedicated to Caius Cæsar; having composed it in consequence of Caius' expedition into Arabia^d. Caius Cæsar was sent into the East, U. C. 753; and as his death happened in the month of February, U. C. 757, it is manifest that the time of the composition of this work

* In the Monumenta Historica, ad Augusti regnum pertinentia, (apud Orellium, Inscriptionum Latinarum amplissima Collectio) there is a fragment which is addressed to Juba by the duumviri, or municipal consuls, of some Colonia Romana, (which the learned editor considers to have been Carthage,) as the Patronus Coloniae. In Festus Avienus' Ora Maritima, (Geographi Minores, iv. p. 18. l. 269. sqq.) we have the following allusion to the fact of Juba's having been himself also sometime one of the duumviri of Tartessus in Spain. Ipsa

Tartessus prius | Cognominata est. multa ac opulens civitas | Ævo vetusto, nunc egena, nunc brevis, | Nunc destituta, nunc ruinarum agger est. | | At vis in illis tanta, vel tantum decus, | Ætate prisca sub fide rerum fuit, | Rex ut superbus, omniumque præpotens, | Quos gens habebat forte tum Maurusia, | Octaviano principi acceptissimus, | Et litterarum semper in studio Juba, | Interfluoque separatus æquore, | Illustriorem semet urbis istius | Duumviratu crederet——

^b Vita Apollonii Tyan. ii. 6. 70. B—D. Cf. Ælian, De Natura Animalium, ix. 58. ^c Operum i. 120. B. In Hexaëmeron Homilia ix. Vide also, Ambrose, Operum i. 125. E. Hexaëmeron vi. v. §. 34. Cf. however, Ælian, De Natura Animalium, xvii. 7. ^d H. N. ii. 67. vi. 31. 32. xii. 31. xxxii. 4.

could not be earlier than U. C. 754. nor later than U. C. 756. It follows, therefore, that Juba was not yet dead, between U. C. 754. and U. C. 756.

Accordingly it is evident from Dio Cassius^e, that Juba was actually alive when the Gætuli rebelled; the time of which rebellion he places U. C. 758. or 759^f. For they were reduced the same year in which Tiberius made his second expedition into Germany^g; viz. the year U. C. 759. The winter immediately subsequent to the reduction, which is just afterwards alluded to as spent in Pannonia, was the winter of U. C. 760: the next year being U. C. 761^h. In these particulars, as to the time of the commencement of the Pannonian war, Velleius Paterculus agrees with Dio; as I have had occasion to prove more at large elsewhereⁱ.

The proconsul of Africa at the time of this reduction was Cossus Cornelius Lentulus. Now he had been consul U. C. 753. Hence, by a standing rule of Augustus' government, he could not be proconsul until five years afterwards, at the earliest: that is, until U. C. 758. And this also is an argument that the rebellion of the Gætuli, and consequently the death of Juba, who was alive at the time, could not be earlier than U. C. 758.

The extant coins of the kings of Mauritania from Juba the elder, to Ptolemy, the son and successor of Juba the younger, and which are principally those of Juba the younger himself; if the numeral notes which they contain are rightly understood of the years of his reign, make him to have reigned forty-eight years at least^k. Pliny, H. N. v. 1: Juba, Ptolemæi pater, qui primus utrique Mauritaniae imperavit: Tacitus, Ann. iv. 5: Mauros Juba rex acceperat donum populi Romani.

^e lv. 28. ^f Ibid. 25.

^g Ibid. 28, 29, 30.

^h Cf. lv. 30. 33.

ⁱ Dissertation viii. vol. i. 337.

^k Eckhel, *Doctrina Nummorum Vett.* iv. 155—161.

Strabo¹ makes his kingdom the gift of Augustus Cæsar. He tells us also^m that Bogus or Bocchus, king of Mauritania, having espoused the part of Antony, perished at Methone in the Messenian territory*, when Agrippa took that place after the battle of Actium. His territories thus became forfeited to Augustus, and might be given by him to Juba. Dio, liii. 26. 25, places this enlargement of his dominions, in what way soever it was made, U. C. 729: and he tells us, before, li. 15. 21, that Juba accompanied Augustus in his expedition against Egypt, U. C. 724, and after the death of Antony and Cleopatra was married by him to Cleopatra their daughter, as well as reinstated in possession of part of his father's dominions, which had become forfeited to the Roman government by Juba the elder's opposition to Julius Cæsar†.

Upon the authority of this testimony, Eckhel deduces the years of his reign from U. C. 724: on which supposition, if he reigned at least forty-eight years, he could not be dead before U. C. 771 or 772. But this learned and accurate writer seems to have overlooked in the present instance the passage from Josephus; which places it beyond a doubt that Juba was not alive after U. C. 760, at the latest. And Josephus is strongly confirmed by the following fact; viz. that

* Cf. Porphyry, *Περὶ ἀποχῆς ζώων*, i. 25. p. 37.

† To this marriage of Juba and Cleopatra, we may refer an extant epigram of Crinagoras, (a contemporary of the reign of Augustus, as his epigrams shew,) which would otherwise be involved in obscurity: *Anthologia*, ii. 132. xix.

*Ἀγχοῦροι μεγάλοι κόσμον χθόνες,
ἄς διὰ Νεῖλος | πιμπλάμενος μελά-*

*νων τέμνει ἀπ' Αἰθιοπῶν, | ἀμφό-
τεροι βασιλῆας ἐκοινώσασθε γάμοι-
σιν, | ἐν γένος Αἰγύπτου καὶ Λιβύης
θέμεναι. | ἐκ πατέρων εἴη παισὶν
πάλι τοῖσιν ἀνάκτων | ἔμπεδον ἡ-
πείροις σκῆπτρον ἐπ' ἀμφοτέrais.*

So likewise, a fragment of Ælian's, in Suidas, voce *Ἀγε-
ται*. Dio li. 21. will imply that this marriage was not earlier than U. C. 725. or 726.

¹ xvii. 3. §. 7. 654.

^m viii. 4. §. 3. 160. Cf. xvii. 3. §. 7. 653.

among the coins of Ptolemy, the son of Juba, there is one which represents him as already king, in the lifetime of Augustus; and what is more as *sole* king. Now this is altogether inexplicable, if his father did not die until four or five years after the death of Augustus himself. It is entirely a gratuitous supposition to assume that he was associated with his father in his lifetime: and if he had been so, the coins which were subsequently struck during the reign of Augustus must have exhibited them both in conjunction.

The language of Strabo is express that Juba died, before Ptolemy his son succeeded him in the kingdom. “Juba,” says he, “died not long ago; and Ptolemy his son has succeeded to his dominions, being his offspring by a daughter of Antony’s and Cleopatra’sⁿ.” Cf. also the end of the book §. 25. 707. But Strabo, it may be objected, both here, and in one or two other passages of the same chapter, speaks of him as νεωστὶ τετελευτηκότα. There is a reference in such words to Strabo’s own time: and the time when Strabo was writing admits of being very exactly determined. For example, lib. iv. cap. vi. §. 9. 86: §. 8. 84, 85. he mentions the reduction of the Rhæti, Vindelici, and Norici, which Dio (liv. 22.) proves to have been, U. C. 738 or 739—as thirty-three years before the time when he was writing.

Lib. vi. cap. iv. §. 2. 312: lib. vii. cap. i. §. 4. 327. he alludes to Germanicus’ triumph over the Cherusci, May 26, U. C. 770: Tacitus, Ann. ii. 42*.

Lib. xii. cap. i. §. 4. 10. he mentions the death of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia; which also was U. C. 770. Cf. Tacitus, Ann. ii. 42. Dio, lvii. 17.

* Cf. also Strabo, lib. i. cap. 2. 769: and Strabo, lib. iv. cap. iii. page 37: lib. vii. cap. i. §. 4. §. 4. page 49. with Tacitus, Ann. with Tacitus, Ann. ii. 22. U. C. i. 69. U. C. 768.

ⁿ Lib. xvii. 3. §. 7. 654.

Lib. xii. cap. iii. §. 29. 124. he alludes to the death of Cotys, king of Thrace, and to the appointment of Zeno, son of Polemo, to be king of Armenia—both of which were U. C. 771—(Cf. Tacitus, Ann. ii. 56. 66 :) or the former early in U. C. 772.

Lib. xii. cap. viii. §. 18. 242: lib. xiii. cap. iii. §. 5. 448. cap. iv. §. 8. 476. the earthquake in Asia is alluded to as a recent event: and that happened U. C. 770. Vide Tacitus, Ann. ii. 47. Dio, lvii. 17.

Lib. xvii. cap. iii. §. 25. 708. Achaia is spoken of as still a proconsular province, which it was not, strictly speaking, after U. C. 768: Tacitus, Ann. i. 76.

But his age is most critically determined by the last sentence of book the sixth: which shews that Germanicus was still alive when he was writing. Now Germanicus was not alive after October ninth, U. C. 772: and his death was known at Rome before the middle of December in the same year.

It is manifest, then, that Strabo was writing either U. C. 771, or early in U. C. 772. Hence, if his expression, “lately dead,” concerning Juba, is to be strictly understood, it would imply that he had died U. C. 770, or early in 771: the last of which dates, and much more the first, would scarcely be reconcilable to the testimony of a coin of his, which bore date in the forty-eighth year of his reign, if deduced from U. C. 724; *after* the reduction of Egypt. For this coin would not begin to bear date, before the autumnal quarter of U. C. 771. itself. And though Strabo alludes to Juba, lib. vi. cap. iv. §. 2. 312. even as governing Mauritania still; this is a statement which at that time could not be true, except as understood generally, and of the fact that his family was continuing to reign over it after him, though he himself was dead.

The truth is, nothing is more common in works

which are not professedly historical, nor tied down to the observance of the utmost strictness in reference to dates, than to find things alluded to in general terms, as of recent occurrence, which happened several years before*. We might produce numerous instances of this way of speaking, if it were necessary. Strabo in particular, from the miscellaneous and desultory character of his *Geographica*, is very apt to be loose and indefinite in his allusions to contemporary history; and to speak of things as connected in point of time, which were really many years asunder†.

For my own part, I see no reason why the years of the reign of Juba should not be supposed to bear date from the time of the death of his father, U. C. 708. He was carried, it is true, by Julius Cæsar to Rome, and exhibited while still a young child, or a boy, among the other trophies of the successes in Africa, at the triumph in the same year¹. But no further degradation appears to have attended him—and he must subsequently have been treated with uniform care and tenderness, to have received that education which made

* As for example, Lactantius, *Divinæ Institutiones*, lib. i. cap. 21. p. 91. *Apud Cypri Salaminem, humanam hostiam Jovi Theucus immolavit; idque sacrificium posteris tradidit: quod est NUPER Hadriano imperante sublatum.* Yet Lactantius was not writing earlier than A. D. 303. and Hadrian died A. D. 138.

† There is an instance of this, lib. ii. cap. v. page 313. and lib. xvi. cap. iv. §. 22. 443. where he alludes to the Arabian expedition of Ælius Gallus as a recent event; yet it was forty years before U. C. 770. There is

another, lib. i. cap. i. p. 27. in which he alludes either to Crassus' or to Antony's expedition into Parthia, as *τὴν νῦν στερτείαν*—the latter of which was fifty years at least, before the time when he was writing. In like manner, x. 2. §. 14. 82. he speaks of Caius Antonius, Cicero's colleague in the consulate, U. C. 691. as his own contemporary; eighty years after the date of that consulship. So also viii. 6. § 23. 278. he alludes to the burning of the temple of Ceres, as a recent event, which Dio, l. 10. shews to have happened U. C. 723. Cf. Zonaras, x. 28. 524. B.

¹ Dio, xliii. 19: Appian, B. Civ. ii. 101: Plutarch, Julius Cæs. 55.

him so learned and accomplished a writer. Deduce the years of his reign, from U. C. 708 : and his forty-eighth would expire, U. C. 756. at which time it is quite certain that he was still alive : though he might be dead in two or three years afterwards.

Among the coins of Ptolemy his son and successor, there is one which Eckhel, vol. iv. p. 160, refers to the occasion specified by Tacitus ^m, U. C. 777. at the close of the war with Tacfarinas; when in return for his services in that war, the Roman senate awarded him the peculiar distinctions, formerly accorded to social or allied kings, who had deserved well of the state, in the shape of such and such presents. The numeral note on this coin is obscure. Eckhel says it denotes VI. and this, he argues, is a strong confirmation of the fact that Ptolemy began to reign, U. C. 772. Deduced from U. C. 772, the sixth of his reign might thus bear date U. C. 777. at the close of the war with Tacfarinas.

But (*pace tanti viri dixerim*) I can perceive nothing in the description of the coin, which appears to identify it with the occasion specified by Tacitus. Tacitus enumerates no insignia but the *scipio eburnus*, and the *toga picta*; the coin shews *two curule chairs*, surmounted by a crown, and on their right a spear, lying crossways. And as to the numeral character, it seems to resemble an X enclosed in a V: and it may stand for XV. XVI. or XVII. as likely as for VI.

A coin is described by Eckhel, iv. 156. among those attributed to Juba, which is to this effect: Rex Juba, regis Jubæ f. (*caput diadematum*) R. Ptola. XVII. *Aquila*. As the letter R. is agreed upon to denote *Regis* or *Regni*, what can Ptolemæi XVII. here denote but the XVII of his reign? And if this be the case, as a further conjecture, may not the two kings *here* have some

^m Annales, iv. 23. 26. 27.

kind of reference to the two *curule* seats in the former instance?

We are informed by Straboⁿ, that Juba founded a Cæsarea in Mauritania, in honour of Augustus his patron, the name of which was formerly Iol: we are told also that he founded games, called Cæsarea, in honour of him likewise; which are commemorated upon his coins. It is exceedingly probable that these games were *quinquennial*; that is, celebrated at the end of every four years complete: and from one of his coins it appears that the anniversary of their celebration, in a certain instance, coincided with the thirty-second year of his reign—Eckhel, p. 156: that is, referred to U. C. 708, it coincided with U. C. 740. On this principle, they would again be in course, thirty-six years afterwards, U. C. 776: which, if Juba died, and Ptolemy began to reign, U. C. 759. might be *in* the XVII. year of the latter.

With regard to the personal history of this Ptolemy, he was the offspring of the marriage before alluded to, between Juba and Cleopatra, the daughter of Antony and Cleopatra^o. According to Suetonius^p, his mother's name was Selene—but this is no objection: as Cleopatra^q herself assumed the name of Selene. In fact Dio himself calls her by each name at once^r. She could not, at the time of her marriage, U. C. 724 or 725, be more than twelve or thirteen years old: for she was one of the two oldest of the children of Antony and Cleopatra^s, who first met in Cilicia, U. C. 712. or 713^t. We have seen from the coins of Ptolemy her son, that he began

ⁿ xvii. 3. §. 12. 665. Cf. Eutropius, vii. 10. ^o Plutarch, Antonius, 87. Strabo, xvii. 3. §. 7. 654. Suidas, in the short memoir which he gives of Juba, voce 'Ιόβας, calls this Cleopatra or Selene, the daughter of Caius Cæsar: by whom we must suppose him to mean Julius Cæsar. But this is a mistake. She was one of twins, Alexander and Cleopatra, the two oldest of the children of Antony and Cleopatra. Julius Cæsar certainly had a child by Cleopatra. But he was a son, and called Cæsario. Selene was no uncommon adjunct to the name of Cleopatra, with the Egyptian princesses of the Syro-Macedonian line. See Strabo, xvi. 2. §. 3. 302. ^p Caius, 26. ^q Dio, l. 5. ^r li. 21. ^s Dio, xlix. 32. ^t Athenæus, iv. 29: Appian, B. C. v. 1. 4. 8: Dio, xlviii. 2.

to reign in the lifetime of Augustus ; and he continued in the undisturbed possession of his dominions all through the reign of Tiberius. But he was not so fortunate in the reign of Caius. Seneca, *De Tranquillitate* : Ptolemæum Africæ regem, Armeniæ Mithridatem, inter Caianas custodias vidimus^v. According to Suetonius^w, he was put to death by Caius, U.C. 792 : according to Dio and Zonaras^x, in the same year with Caius' German expedition, and marriage to Cæsonia—U.C. 793 ; which, I think, is nearer to the truth. For his death excited a rebellion in Mauritania—to which Pliny alludes^y as an event coincident with the beginning of the reign of Claudius : Romana arma primum Claudio principe in Mauritania bellavere, Ptolemæum regem a C. Cæsare interemptum ulciscente liberto Ardemone*.

The last year of the reign of Ptolemy being thus U.C. 793. and his first U.C. 759. he must have reigned 34 years : which is no improbable supposition. We do not know in what year he was born ; but had he been born in the earliest possible, U.C. 725, his age would be only sixty-eight at his death.

I think that these considerations serve to place it almost beyond a doubt, that the precise year of Juba's death is U.C. 759 : and rather late in that year than early. Now Glaphyra, even after his death, had been living some time with her father Archelaus in Cappadocia, before Archelaus the son of Herod saw her there, and fell in love with her. We need not argue further that, according to Roman law and Roman

* It appears, indeed, from the authorities cited, that there were two rebellions of the Mauritanians, occasioned by the death of Ptolemy, one under Caius, and suppressed before Claudius became

emperor, consequently, U.C. 793 ; the other in the first or second of his reign, and ultimately suppressed by Galba, U.C. 796 or 797.

^v xi. 10. ^w Caius, 26. 35.
^y H. N. v. 1. Cf. Dio, lx. 8. 9.

^x Dio, lix. 25 ; Zonaras, xi. 6. 557. B.

usage, a law and an usage which the wife of Juba might be expected to obey, his widow would be required to mourn for her husband ten months, before she could form a new match^z. Let their eagerness to be united to each other have been ever so great, and their disregard of decency ever so flagrant, yet under the circumstances of the case, they could not have had an opportunity of being married, before the beginning of U. C. 760. Glaphyra had not been long come to Judæa before her death—nor, as the context implies, had she been dead long, before Archelaus himself was deposed.

It remains only to shew that Glaphyra might still be young enough to excite the cupidity of Archelaus, U. C. 759. or 760, though she had been twice married previously.

Glaphyra was the daughter of Archelaus and Glaphyra, being so named after her grandmother, who is described before her marriage as an ἑταῖρα^{a*}. It appears to be implied that she was not born until her father became king of Cappadocia. Now he was sometime appointed by Antony; and was deposed by Tiberius, U. C. 770, in the fiftieth year of his reign^b. Hence he was appointed U. C. 720 or 721†. His wife Glaphyra, we may presume, was dead, when he was married to Pythodoris, the widow of Polemo, king of Pontus—who, however, was still alive U. C. 740‡.^c

* Yet in Josephus, De Bello, i. xxiv. 2. she is said to have been lineally descended from Darius Hystaspis.

† Cf. Strabo, lib. xii. cap. 2. §. 12. 46. Dio, however, places his appointment U. C. 718. See xlix. 32, 33. It appears from Strabo, (xii. 2. §. 12. 45.) that he was not of the hereditary

family of the kings of Cappadocia, which was properly descended from Ariobarzanes, elected by permission of the Roman senate, after the conquest of Asia, in the war with Antiochus Magnus. But this family had failed μετὰ τριγονίαν.

‡ If the Marmor, quoted by Eckhel, ii. 370, is to be believed,

^z Ovid, Fasti, iii. 133, 134. Seneca, Consolatio ad Helviam, xvi. 1. ^a Dio, xlix. 32. ^b Tacitus, Annales, ii. 42 : Dio, lvii. 17. ^c Dio, liv. 24. Josephus, Ant. xvi. ii. 2.

U. C. 738, as I had occasion to shew elsewhere^d, Glaphyra his daughter was married to Alexander, one of the sons of Herod and Mariamne: at which time, it is exceedingly probable she was not more than fifteen or sixteen years of age. U. C. 749. Alexander, and his brother Aristobulus, were both put to death: and then Glaphyra was probably twenty-six or twenty-seven. How soon after that she might be married to Juba, I cannot undertake to say. Josephus^e tells us that Herod sent her back to her father, immediately after the death of her husband. But even in U. C. 759. in which year he died, she would be only thirty-six or thirty-seven: and she might possibly be still younger. Herodias was probably not a younger woman, when she too retained sufficient of her personal attractions, to engage the affections of the tetrarch of Galilee, and to induce him to persuade her to divorce herself from her existing husband, and to marry him. Vide Dissertation x. infra.

he was not dead even in U. C. 752. His death, and the circumstances under which it happened, are mentioned by Strabo, lib. xi. cap. 2. §. 11. 386. Cf. *ibid.* §. 3. 373. His death is again mentioned, and the fact of Pythodoris, his wife's, reigning in his stead, lib. xi. 2. §. 18. 404. Cf. also lib. xii. cap. 3. §. 29. 124. which again mentions both his death, and the marriage of Pythodoris with Archelaus, and her surviving him, and being a widow when Strabo was writing. Polemo was the son of Zeno, the *ῥήτωρ* of Laodicea in Phrygia—and was made king first by Antony, afterwards by Augustus: see Strabo, lib. xii. 7. §. 16. 236.

as Pythodoris was the daughter of Pythodorus of Tralles. See xiv. 1, §. 42. 577. This Polemo must have been altogether a different person from him, on whose demise the Pontus was reduced to a province under the name of Pontus Polemoniacus. Vide Aurelius Victor, in Nerone, who dates it within the first five years of Nero's reign, that is, between U. C. 807 and 812. Cf. Suetonius, Nero, 18: Tacitus, *Historiæ*, iii. 47. Jerome, however, in *Chronico*, and Eckhel, ii. 373, both shew that the year of this reduction was U. C. 815 or 816. The Polemo in question was the son of the preceding.

^d Dissertation xiv. vol. i. 490, 491. ^e Ant. xvii. i. 1. De Bello, i. xxviii. 1.

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION VII.

On the Date of the Proconsular Authority of Tiberius.

Vide Dissertation viii. vol. i. page 344. last line.

THE conclusions, which I have endeavoured to establish respecting the date of Tiberius' triumph, and of his association in the empire with Augustus, may be materially illustrated and confirmed by the testimony of Ovid's *Tristia*, and *Epistolæ de Ponto*: which were all written between the time of his banishment, and that of his death, in the third or fourth year of the reign of Tiberius.

The time of his banishment, as well as the order and regularity of the several compositions, above referred to, may be ascertained from the following passages :

Ut patria careo; *bis* frugibus area trita est :

Dissiluit nudo pressa *bis* uva pede.

Tristium lib. iv. vi. 19. Cf. lib. iii. x. 15, 16. 35—40.

Bis me sol adiit gelidæ post frigora brumæ,

Bisque suum tacto Pisce peregit iter. Ibid. lib. iv. vii. 1.

Hunc quoque de Getico, nostri studiose, *libellum*,

Littore, præmissis *quattuor* adde meis.

Ibid. lib. v. i. 1. Cf. lib. i. x: lib. ii. i: lib. iii. i. viii.

27—34: xiv: lib. iv. i: *De Ponto*, lib. ii. v.

Ut sumus in Ponto *ter* frigore constitit Ister :

Facta est Euxini dura *ter* unda maris. Ibid. lib. v. x. 1.

Perque dies multos lateris cruciatibus uror,

Sed quod non modico frigore læsit *hyems*. Ibid. lib. v. xiii. 5.

Hic me pugnantem cum frigore, cumque sagittis,

Cumque meo fato, *quarta* fatigat *hyems*.

Epistolæ de Ponto, lib. i. ii. 27.

Ut careo vobis, Stygius detrusus in oras,

Quattuor autumnos Pleiās orta facit. Ibid. lib. i. viii. 28.

In Scythia nobis *quinquennis* Olympias acta est :

Jam tempus lustrí transit in alterius. Ibid. lib. iv. vi. 5.

Hic mihi Cimmerico *bis tertia* ducitur æstas

Littore, pellitos inter agenda Getas. Ibid. lib. iv. x. 1.

Ille quidem dixit, sed me jam, Care, nivali

Sexta relegatum *bruma* sub axe videt.

Ibid. lib. iv. xiii. 39*.

It thus appears that Ovid's rule is to date the years of his exile in succession from the winter, rather than from any other quarter of the year: the reason of which is, that he was ordered into banishment, and arrived at his destination in that season in particular. *Tristium* lib. i. x. 3. says, in the month of December: with which, however, we must compare *Tristium* lib. i. ii. iii. and *De Ponto*, lib. ii. vii. 57.†

* These citations sufficiently prove that the *Tristia*, and the *Epistolæ de Ponto*, as we have them, are arranged in regular order; though lib. iii. ix. of the latter, 51-54. it is said, *Nec liber ut fieret, sed uti sua cuique daretur*

| *Littera, propositum curaque nostra fuit.* | Post modo collectas, utcumque sine ordine, junxi :

| Hoc opus electum ne mihi forte putes. *Epp. de Ponto*, lib. iv. ii. and lib. i. viii. may appear an exception to this general regularity, if both are addressed to the same person, Severus. I should think, however, that the latter Severus is distinct from the former; and by comparing lib. i. viii. with lib. iv. vii. it will appear that the former is sufficiently regularly placed where we have it. If there is any difficulty with respect to *De Ponto*, lib. iv. ix. an Epistle written either *in* or just *before*, the year when Græcinus was consul, as compared

with iv. x. 1—it admits of being explained. The Epistle shews (59. 60.) that Græcinus' term of office was to expire in the December of one year, and his brother's (*Flaccus*', 69. 75) was to succeed, on the first of January in the next. It shews also (69. 70.) that they owed their consulates respectively to the *designatio* of Augustus. The letter might have been written U. C. 768—upon Ovid's hearing of this fact: and yet not reach Rome until the end of that year, or the beginning of the next. The writer did not exactly know whether the one Græcinus would be consul *ex Kal. Jan.* as well as the other (see 1—8) or not. Hence it is no objection that the *Fasti (Almeloveeniani)* shew Pomponius Græcinus consul *ex Kal. Jul.* U. C. 769; and Flaccus Græcinus, *ex Kal. Jan.* U. C. 770.

† The truth is, indeed, that he might be ordered into banish-

To the above notices we may add *Tristium* lib. iii. xiii. written on his birthday, most probably in the *second* year of his banishment, U. C. 763. and lib. v. iii. 1. written at the period of the *Liberalia*, either the same year, or more probably the next.

Now when *De Ponto*, lib. iv. xiii. was written, which lines 39. 40. place in the *sixth* winter of Ovid's exile, line 25. shews that Augustus was dead. Also, when *De Ponto*, lib. iv. vi. was written, which lines 5, 6. place in the *second lustrum* of his exile, both Augustus and Maximus (who died a little before him) were dead: and Ovid had written a poem on the death or deification of the former. See lines 9—18. Compare likewise lib. iv. viii. 63, 64: ix. 127—134.

Again, *De Ponto* iv. iv. (line 17.) was written the year before the consulate of the two *Sexti*, that is, U. C. 766: and lib. iv. v. in the year of their consulate, U. C. 767. *ineunte*. And as lib. iv. v. immediately precedes lib. iv. vi. it follows that by the *quenquennis olympias*, spoken of lib. iv. vi. 5. it is meant that five years of exile were now past; and by the *lustrum alterum* in the next line, that the second five years were *then* current: the first year of which was not earlier than the year of the consulate of the two *Sexti*, and of the death of Augustus, U. C. 767. On this principle, the first year of Ovid's exile, dated from the winter quarter, is U. C. 761. *exeunte*, or rather U. C. 762. *ineunte*†.

It agrees with this conclusion that, *Tristium* lib. iv. x.

ment in December, or before, but would not reach his destination until some months later.

* It is true that lib. iv. xiii. which lines 27, 28. will shew, could not have been written until some time after the acces-

sion of Tiberius—is said, as we have seen, lines 39, 40, to have been written in the *sixth* winter of Ovid's exile. This sixth winter would be strictly that of U. C. 767. if reckoned inclu-

5. 6. 13. (cf. Fasti, lib. iv. 81.) he tells us he was born on the second day of the *quinguatrus*, March 20. (cf. Fasti, lib. iii. 809—814.) U. C. 711 : and Tristium l. c 95 : lib. iv. viii. 33 : Ibis, l. 11. that he was banished *in* or not long *after* his fiftieth year. He would enter on his fifty-first year, March 20, U. C. 761.

Hence, De Ponto, lib. i. ii, (27) would be written in the winter, U. C. 765 : lib. i. viii. (28) in the autumn of the same year : and the Epistles, between lib. i. viii. and lib. iv. iv. being written in regular order, would be written between the autumn, U. C. 765, and the time when Ovid heard of the designation of the *Sexti* to the consulate, U. C. 766.

De Ponto, lib. ii. i. is one of these, and relates exclusively to some triumph ; which verses 25—28, prove presumptively to have been in the winter ; and verses 1. 45, 46. 49—52, to have been that which Tiberius celebrated January 16, U. C. 765, for his successes in Pannonia, U. C. 762. Another allusion to this triumph occurs in the next Epistle,

Adde triumphatos modo Pæonas, adde quieti
Subdita montanæ brachia Dalmatiæ.

Lib. ii. ii. 77. &c.

The celebration of this triumph in a composition, which he calls after it, the *Triumphus*, Ovid projected

sively of the winter of U. C. 762. But Ovid reckons in this instance exclusively of it—so as to make the sixth winter that of U. C. 768. And this will reconcile the mention of the sixth *summer* in lib. iv. x. with that of the sixth *winter*, lib. iv. xiii : and both with the assumed date of the letter to Græcinus, lib. iv. ix.

There is an allusion, Tristium lib. ii. i. 167. to the *Nepotes* of

Augustus: Utque tui faciunt sidus
juvenile nepotes, | Per tua, per-
que sui facta parentis eant :
which some commentators have understood of Caius and Lucius Cæsar. But it refers to Germanicus and Drusus ; at this time both standing in the relation of *sons* to Tiberius, and of *grandsons* to Augustus. Caius and Lucius were dead before Ovid was banished.

as soon as he heard of it: lib. ii. i. 63: and when he wrote lib. ii. v. 27, &c. he had begun it, but laid it by for a time.

Nuper ut hic magni pervenit fama Triumphi;
 Ausus sum tantæ condere molis opus.
 Obruit audentem rerum gravitasque nitorque,
 Nec potui cœpti pondera ferre mei.

Yet he completed it at last, and sent it to the city before he wrote Epp. lib. iii: and subsequently he writes,

Hæc tibi non vanam portantia verba salutem
 Naso Tomitana mittit ab urbe tuus.
 Utque suo faveas mandat, Rufine, Triumpho,
 In vestras venit si tamen ille manus.

De Ponto, lib. iii. iv. 1.

See lines 51—60 in particular.

The difference of this triumph from that of Germanicus, a. d. vii. Kal. Jun. U. C. 770. Tacitus, Ann. ii. 41. appears from the following passages.

Quo pede nunc utar, dubia est sententia nobis.
 Alter enim de te, Rhene, triumphus adest.

De Ponto, lib. iii. iv. 87.

Quid cessas currum, pompamque parare triumphis
 Livia? jam nullas dant tibi bella moras.
 Perfida damnatas Germania projicit hastas.
 Jam pondus dices omen habere meum.
 Crede, brevique fides aderit, geminabit honorem
 Filius, et junctis, ut prius, ibit equis*.

Ibid. 95.

Accordingly, when the Fasti were written, or rather completed, in their present state, Ovid had lived to hear of this triumph also.

Pax erat, et vestri, Germanice, caussa triumphi
 Tradiderat famulas jam tibi Rhenus aquas. Fasti, i. 285.

* There is an allusion to some triumphus, in the preceding Epistle, (lib. iii. iii.) 85—92. which, as it occurs in the account of a supposed vision, may be either

to the triumph of Tiberius, *De Pannoniis*, already celebrated, or, though I do not think it so probable, to this anticipated one, over the Germans.

This was a possible event, even though the death of Ovid be placed, with Jerome in *Chronico*, p. 157. in the fourth of Tiberius, U. C. 770—771.

To the war in Germany, U. C. 762—765. as waged by Tiberius in conjunction with the *Nepotes* of Augustus, Germanicus and Drusus, allusions occur, *Tristium* lib. ii. i. 165—178. 229, 230 : *Tristium* lib. iii. xii. 45—48. which I should think was written in the spring of U. C. 763. after Ovid had heard of the rebellion, begun with the death of Varus : vide lines 1—4, &c. : and to the subsequent triumph, U. C. 765. proleptically, *Tristium* lib. iv. ii. throughout: the time of which last composition too, I should apprehend to be after he had heard of the resumption of hostilities by Tiberius, U. C. 763. Nor is this inconsistent with *Tristium* lib. iv. vi. 19 : for the *second* autumn, since Ovid's arrival in the Pontus, would be that of this year itself, U. C. 763.

It seems to me a probable conjecture, also, that *De Ponto*, lib. ii. viii. which is addressed to Maximus Cotta, in this same year, U. C. 765. to acknowledge the arrival of three statues or busts, Augustus', Tiberius', and Livia's, respectively, was written after Tiberius' association in the empire had become known to Ovid. The terms in which he speaks of Tiberius are just as magnificent, as his language concerning Augustus.

1. Redditus est nobis Cæsar cum Cæsare nuper,
Quos mihi misisti, Maxime Cotta, deos.
Utque tuum munus numerum quem debet haberet,
Est ibi Cæsaribus Livia juncta suis.
13. Cæsareos video vultus, velut ante videbam:
Vix hujus voti spes fuit ulla mihi.
23. Parce, vir immenso major virtutibus orbe,
Justaque vindictæ supprime lora tuæ.
Parce, precor, sæcli decus indelebile nostri,
Terrarum dominum quem sua cura facit.

37. Et tua, si fas est, a Cæsare proxime Cæsar,
 Numina sint precibus non inimica meis.
 Sic fera quamprimum pavido Germania vultu
 Ante triumphantes serva feratur equos.
 Sic pater in Pylios, Cumæos mater in annos,
 Vivant ; et possis filius esse dei.
53. Cæsaris adventu tota gladiator arena
 Exit ; et auxilium non leve vultus habet.
 Nos quoque vestra juvet quod, qua licet, ora videmus :
 Intrata est Superis quod domus una tribus *.

At least De Ponto, lib. iv. v. 23—26. supplies an illustration of the fact referred to from Dio^a, about Augustus' recommendation of Germanicus to the senate ; and of the senate to Tiberius. It is said of the duties of the consul Sextus, U. C. 767,

—Aut feret Augusto solitam natoque salutem ;
 Deque patrum noto consulet officio.
 Tempus ab his vacuum Cæsar Germanicus omne
 Auferet. a magnis hunc colet ille deis.

De Ponto, lib. iv. ix. 75. alludes likewise to some command of Pomponius Flaccus', as a recent event ; and being written U. C. 767 or 768. it so far proves that this command might possibly be over, and Flaccus again at Rome, as Suetonius and Pliny suppose, U. C. 765 or 766^b. The time of his præfecture in the vicinity of Ovid, is implicitly shewn to have been under the reign of Augustus : so that it is not inconsistent with the testimony of Ovid, that Tacitus, Ann. ii. 66, informs us he was the person whom Tiberius made choice of, U. C. 772, to succeed Latinus Pandus in the proprætorship of Mœsia, and to carry into effect the designs of Tiberius upon the liberty of Rhescuporis. Pomponius had either never been proprætor of that province

* These statues are again alluded to, lib. iv. ix. 105—110 : an Epistle written after the death of Augustus.

^a Dissertation viii. vol. i. 341, 342.

^b Ibid. 343.

before, or never yet under Tiberius. Velleius, who mentions his appointment, ii.129, calls him *consularem virum* at the time; as he truly was, U. C. 772, having been consul U. C. 770. De Ponto, lib. ii. ix. the time of which we have presumptively ascertained to be U. C. 765 or 766. is addressed to king Cotys, the nephew of Rhescuporis; who must at that time have been alive, and unmolested. Cf. Tacitus, Ann. ii. 64.

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION VIII.

The rate of travelling by sea or land, in ancient times, illustrated by Examples.

Vide Dissertation vi. vol. i. page 306. line 16. and Dissertation ix. page 347. line 8.

ACCORDING to the rate of travelling which prevailed in ancient times, one who set out from Rome, even on the first of June, would not be in Judæa before the beginning or the middle of August. I shall illustrate this assertion by a number of examples.

I. It was one of the regulations of Augustus^o, which he made U.C. 727. or before, relating to the governors of provinces, that, ὅταν τῷ ὁ διάδοχος ἔλθῃ, ἔκ τε τοῦ ἔθνους αὐτίκα αὐτὸν (the predecessor in office) ἐξορμαῖσθαι, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀνακομιδῇ μὴ ἐγγυρόνιζεν, ἀλλ' ἐντὸς τριῶν μηνῶν ἐπανιέναι. It is implied hereby that even in the summer season, when governors commonly relieved each other, three months were not more than sufficient for the return of former governors to Italy; from the remotest provinces, as well as from the nearest.

II. The intelligence of the death of Tiberius, which happened on the 16th of March, three days before the passover, U.C. 790^p, was not received in Judæa until four days after the feast of Pentecost^q.

III. Herod, who set out from Judæa, as we saw in its proper place, about the Pentecost of U.C. 714. May 10; and that by way of Egypt, which was

^o Dio, liii. 15. ^p Tacitus, Ann. vi. 50. Suetonius, Tiberius, 73. Dissertation vii. vol. i. 332. ^q Ant. Jud. xviii. v. 3.

the shortest route; did not arrive in Rome before the third or fourth week in September.

IV. St. Paul, who set out in Easter week from Philippi^r, did not expect without great dispatch to reach Jerusalem by Whitsuntide.

V. Philo, in Flaccum, speaks of the voyage from Brundisium to Syria in general terms, as *μακρὸν ὄντα καὶ καματηρόν*^s; and Jerome^t describing its course states that he left Italy in the month of August, *flantibus Etesiiis*; yet did not reach Judæa, except *media hyeme, et frigore gravissimo*. And what he understands by the winter months in this country, we may learn from his Commentary upon Zacharias^u: Octavus apud Hebræos mensis, qui apud illos Maresvan... apud nos November dicitur, hyemis exordium est: in quo, æstatis calore consumpto, omnis terra virore nudatur, et mortalium corpora contrahuntur.

VI. Tiridates was nine months in travelling to Rome from Armenia^v; of which the first four or five might be taken up in reaching the Hellespont; and the rest in coming thence to Rome. And though he travelled by land, and in the summer season, the journey by sea would have taken up at least half the time.

VII. I mentioned the cases of Cicero, and of the younger Pliny, previously. The letters of the former, however, supply many instances of the rate of travelling anciently: some of which I shall specify.

I. Epp. ad Fam. xii. Ep. x. xii. Cassius wrote to the Roman senate from Syria, *nonis Maii*, (May 7th;) and his letter, though sent by special messengers, does not appear to have been received before June 30. *prid. kal. Quin.*

II. xvi. Ep. xxi. Letters, which appear to have been

^r Acts xx. 6. 16. ^s Operum ii. 521. l. 5. ^t Operum iv. Pars iia. 459. *ad calcem*. Adv. Ruffinum lib. iii. Cf. Epistolæ, 86. Ibid. 672. ^u Operum iii. 1707. *ad calcem*. ^v Dio, lxiii. 2.

sent to Cicero the younger from Rome, reached him at Athens *forty-six* days after the posts set out.

III. Epp. ad Atticum i. Ep. xx. A letter, written by Atticus at Athens, *id. Februar.* was received by Cicero at Rome, *iv. id. Maii.*

IV. v. Ep. xviii. xix. Cicero received in his province a letter from Atticus who was at Rome, on the *forty-seventh* day after the setting out of the post; which he considers an instance of extraordinary dispatch. Not long before the same day, which was *XI. kal. Oct.* (Sept. 21.) he had just received letters, written at Rome *XIV. kal. Sextiles*, July 19: which was more than two months after date.

VIII. The delays of travelling in the winter season were necessarily even greater than usual at any other time.

I. Nicias, in Thucydides^w, reminds the Athenians that it was a four months' voyage during the winter from Sicily to Athens.

II. It was by extraordinary efforts of speed that the death of Caius Cæsar in Asia, *a.d. viii. kal. Mar.* (Feb. 22.) was made known to Augustus, in Italy, *a.d. iv. non. April.* (by the 2nd of April^x.)

III. The ship which brought the last letters of Caligula to Petronius, and could not have set out long before Jan. 24. the day of his death, was *three* months on the road^y.

IV. The ashes of Germanicus, who died at Antioch on the ninth of October, U.C. 772^z. were not brought to Rome by his widow, though she travelled, *nihil intermissa navigatione hybernæ maris*^a, much before the usual period of the *Ludi Megalenses*; that is, the *fourth of April*^b, U.C. 773.

^w vi. 21. ^x Cenotaphia Pisana. ^y Jos. De Bello, ii x. 5. ^z Kalendarium Antiatinum, apud Foggini. Tacitus, Ann. ii. 72. ^a Tacitus, Ann. iii. 1.
^b Ibid. 6.

V. Herod, who as we saw was enabled to return from Italy by the end of September, U. C. 714, was yet not able to arrive in Judæa before the spring of U. C. 715.

To these examples of the rate of travelling anciently, in the summer and the winter season, respectively, we may add the following, which will apply alike to each.

I. The death of Germanicus Cæsar at Antioch, (which took place, as it has just been mentioned, on the ninth of October,) was not communicated at Rome until about the period of the Saturnalia^b; that is, not much before December the 19th^c, an interval of at least two months.

II. The Emperor Otho is said to have died eleven days before his birthday; that is, upon April the 17th, U. C. 822^d. Soon after Vespasian heard of this event and of the accession of Vitellius, he was saluted emperor^e at Cæsarea^f, by the army which he was commanding in Judæa, on the v. id. Julias, July the 11th, in the same year. This was almost an interval of three months.

III. The death of Nero happened the second week in June, U. C. 821^g, and the death of Galba on the 15th of January, U. C. 822^h. Upon hearing of the death of Nero and the accession of Galba, Titus Cæsar was sent by Vespasian from Judæa to salute the latter. When he was arrived in Achaia, which means at Corinth, within two or three weeks' journey from Rome, Titus heard of the assassination of Galbaⁱ *. He must

* Cf. Tacitus, *Historiæ*, ii. 1. of thirty Roman miles and upwards in a day. Strabo, vi. 3. §. 7. 299. reckons the distance of the journey from Brundisium to Rome, alone, would have occupied ten days' time, at the rate of 360 miles. Livy

^b Suetonius, *Caius*, 6. ^c Macrobius, *Sat.* i. 10. ^d Dio, *lxiv.* 15. Suetonius, *Otho*, 2. ^e Suetonius, *Vespasianus*, 6. ^f Jos. De Bello, *iv.* x. 2—4. ^g Dio, *lxxiii.* 29. Suetonius, *Nero*, 57. Jos. De Bello, *iv.* ix. 2. ^h Tacitus, *Historiæ*, i. 27. 41. ⁱ Jos. De Bello, *iv.* ix. 2. 19. Dio, *lxxv.* 8.

have heard of this event, then, about the beginning of February, U. C. 822: between which time and the death of Nero, U. C. 821, the interval would not be less than eight months. And this interval must have been taken up as follows. First, by the transmission to Judæa of the news of the death of Nero and of the accession of Galba; and secondly, by the journey of Titus from that country as far as Corinth in Greece; where he was at the beginning of February. In this case, we cannot allow less than two or three months to the former; and four or five months to the latter.

IV. The death of Vitellius, according to Josephus, took place on the third of Apellæus, which answered in that year to the fifth of our November; but the news of his death did not reach Vespasian, who was then at Alexandria, before the close of the winter quarter¹: and the same post, according to Suetonius, brought him intelligence of the victory at Cremona; which victory was obtained October 19. U. C. 822. This was an interval of more than four months at least.

At the time when Vespasian was apprised of this event, he dispatched his son Titus from Alexandria against Jerusalem; and Titus, having effected his march into Judæa with no delay, sat down to the siege of the city at the passover U. C. 823. or A. D. 70^m. The passover this year fell almost as late as possible, viz.

Livy, xxxvi. 21. Plutarch, Cato Major, 14. B. C. 193, Cato the censor certainly travelled from Brundisium to Rome in five or six days: but this was an extraordinary instance of dispatch. The usual length of the journey was ten days. Luce minus de-

cima dominam venietis in Urbem, | Ut festinatum non faciatis iter. Ovid, De Ponto, iv. v. 7. Brundisium decimis jubet hanc adtingere castris. Lucan, v. 374. which is in reference to Cæsar's march from Rome to Brundisium, U. C. 705.

¹ De Bello, iv. xi. 4. 5. Tacitus, Historiæ, iii. 48. iv. 81. Suetonius, Vespasianus, 7. Cf. Philostratus, Apollonius Tyan. v. 10. 237. C. D. m De Bello, v. iii. 1. xiii. 7.

on April 13ⁿ. Titus therefore could not have set out from Alexandria earlier than the last week in March.

V. The news of the arrival of Vespasian at Rome (who set out from Egypt while Titus was engaged on the siege of Jerusalem) was brought to the latter at Berytus when the siege was over; and his father's birthday, November the 17th, was at hand^o *.

VI. The defeat of Cestius Gallus, U. C. 819, took place on the eighth of Dios; and the news of it was brought to Nero in Achaia; who dispatched Vespasian, as Vespasian did Titus, from thence^p. Titus travelled by way of Alexandria, having made the passage in the winter season; so as to join his father at Ptolemais in the spring^q. The news of the misfortune of Cestius, then, must have been brought to Nero between the eighth of Dios, U. C. 819, (which in that year corresponded to the middle of October,) and January, U. C. 820: which was a three months' interval: and Titus must have arrived in Judæa, after travelling

* Tacitus, *Historiæ*, iv. 53: the rebuilding of the Capitol was begun, U. C. 823, June 21, when, according to Dio, lxvi. 10, and Suetonius, *Vespasianus*, 8, Vespasian was at Rome, and must consequently have arrived by that time: yet Tacitus, *Historiæ*, iv. 52: he was still at Alexandria, *sævo adhuc mari*, which means until the middle of February at least.

The latter, however, is at variance with himself, as well as with the two former, on this point: for, lib. cit. 81, he supposes Vespasian to have continued at Alexandria until the setting in of the Etesian winds: which would be about the mid-

dle of July. But it is needless to observe that this very supposition refutes itself: as every one knows that an *Etesian* or *North* wind is almost directly in the face of a voyage from Alexandria to Rome: and no one who desired to sail with all expedition from the former to the latter, would think of waiting expressly for it. How far this discrepancy may serve to discredit the truth of the miracle, which it is pretended that Vespasian wrought during the time of his waiting at Alexandria, (which nevertheless has to a certain extent the countenance of Suetonius' testimony) I leave to others to decide.

ⁿ Dissertation vii. vol. i. 333.

^o De Bello, vii. ii. 1. iv. 2. iii. 1. iv. 1. Suetonius, *Vespasianus*, 2. ^p Jos. De Bello, ii. xix. 9. xx. i. iii. i. 1. 3. ^q iii. iv. 2. vii. 3.

by way of Alexandria, and consequently by sea, about the time of the month Artemisius, which would answer to the beginning of April, U. C. 820.

VII. A decree of the Roman senate, in favour of the Jews, was passed on the ides of December, U. C. 707, in consequence of a command from Julius Cæsar. This command was given by Cæsar when he was at Antioch in Syria, after the Alexandrian war^r. Now he was not at Antioch later than the end of July: since on August 2. he defeated Pharnaces at Ziela in Cappadocia^s. The edict, therefore, had been issued originally in the month of July at least; and yet the Jewish delegates did not arrive with it in Rome before the month of December following.

VIII. Ignatius was at Smyrna, on his way to Rome, when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans, τῇ πρὸ ἐννέα καλανδῶν Σεπτεμβρίου, August 24^t: and he suffered, according to his Martyrium^u, immediately after his arrival in the city, on December 20. If so, he was three months, or more, on the road between Rome and Smyrna only.

If the reader is curious to see more examples to the same effect with those produced, he will find them in the following instances.

U. C. 544. Lælius was thirty-four days in travelling from Tarraco in Spain to Rome: Livy, xxvii. 7: xxvi. 51.

Centesima lux est hæc ab interitu Publii Clodii, et opinor ultra quam fines imperii Populi Romani sunt, ea non solum fama jam de illo, sed etiam lætitia peragravit: Cicero, Pro Milone, 35.

The day of Clodius' death was xiii Kal. Feb.: Ibid. 10.

Epp. ad Atticum, vi. 1: between Cicero's writing to

^r Ant. Jud. xiv. viii. 5.

^s Eckhel, Doctrina Numorum Veterum, vi. 3.

^t Epist. ad Rom. x. Patres Apostolici, 86g. A. B.

^u cap. 24. Ibid. 1001. B.

Atticus, from Cybistra in Cappadocia, ad x Kal. Oct. and the receipt of Atticus' answer ad diem quintum Terminalia, was *five* months' interval complete. Ad Att. iv. 17, a letter from Ephesus written v Id. Sextiles was received at Rome not before ix Kalends of November: and on this last day arrived also another letter from Gaul, on the coast opposite to Britain, written a. d. vi Kal. Oct.

The decree for Cicero's return from exile was passed on the Kalends of June; his arrival at Brundisium was on the Nones of August, his daughter's birthday: Pro P. Sextio, 31. 63. Now, Pro Plancio, 41, his exile was spent at Thessalonica: so that it required two months and upwards to travel from Rome to Thessalonica and back, even in the summer season: Cf. Dio, xxxviii. 17, 18; xxxix. 6. 9: Plutarch, Cicero, 33.

Philotimus, Cæsar's freedman, was at Rhodes on his way to Rome, May 28; yet he did not arrive in Italy until pridie Idus Sextiles, August 12: Cicero, Epistolæ ad Att. xi. 19. 23: Ad Fam. xiv. 24. 23.

Cæsar was at Ziela in Cappadocia, Aug. 2, U. C. 707: yet, notwithstanding his characteristic dispatch, he did not set out from Lilybæum for Africa, before vi Kal. Januarias, in the same year: De Bello Africano, 1. 2: Plutarch, Vita, 52.

Vitellius was declared emperor on the first of January, U. C. 822. News that the eastern army had sworn allegiance to him, did not reach him until the middle of June at least: so that it required five months for messengers to go to, and return from, the East: Tacitus, Historiæ, i. 52. 12. 55: ii. 73. 70.

The embassy from the Seres and Indi, which Augustus received at Antioch, U. C. 734, was four years on the road: Florus, iv. 12. sect. 62.*

* In the Codex Apocryphus, cap. iii. speaking of the journey of St. Thomas to India, the writer

The ambassadors from Vologeses, sent about midsummer, U. C. 815, arrived at Rome, *veris principio*, U. C. 816: Tacitus, Ann. xv. 24. 12. 17.

Ἡ δὲ πορεία ἐπ' αὐτὰ (that is, the walls, not of Rome, but of the empire as such) εἴ τις βούλοιτο ἰδεῖν, μηνῶν τε καὶ ἐνιαυτῶν ἀρξαμένῳ βαδίζειν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως: Aristides, xiv. 355. l. 10.*

This same writer, *ιερώων λόγων* ii. Oratio xxiv. 481, *ad principium*—giving an account of a journey of his own, to Rome, from Smyrna or Pergamus, on which he set out *χειμῶνος μεσοῦντος*, makes it appear that though he travelled so expeditiously that even the imperial couriers did not outstrip him, yet he arrived at his destination only *ἡμέρα ἑκατοστῇ ὕστερον ἢ ἐκινήθη οἴκοθεν*. It must be observed, however, that he was detained sometime by sickness on the road.

Ut mater juvenem, quem Notus invido

Flatu Carpathii trans maris æquora,

Cunctantem *spatio* longius *annuo*,

Dulci distinet a domo.

Horace, iv. v. 9.

Non ego cessavi, nec fecit inertia serum :

Ultima me vasti sustinet ora freti.

Dum venit huc rumor, properataque carmina fiunt,

Factaque eunt ad vos, *annus* abisse potest.

Ovid, Epp. De Ponto, iii. iv. 57.

Dum tua pervenit, dum littera nostra recurrens

Tot maria ac terras permeat, *annus* abit.

Ibid. iv. xi. 15.

makes it matter of wonder, that he accomplished that journey in three months, *Quod alias trium annorum spacio vix expediebatur*.

* This assertion is illustrated by Procopius, De Bello Vandalico, i. 1. in his description of the extent of the empire as it was under Justinian, or rather, at the time of the division of the empire into the two por-

tions of the east and the west, upon the death of Theodosius, A. D. 395. The computation is made in days' journeys.

The same author, we may observe by the way, still reckons it a year's journey even by sea, A. D. 533 or 534. from Constantinople to Carthage and back: see De Bello Vandalico i. 10: the speech of John of Cappadocia to Justinian.

It illustrates the truth of both these observations, that the news of Tiberius' triumph, January 16, U. C. 765, did not reach Ovid at Tomi, before the autumnal quarter of the same year.

1 Macc. viii. 19, it is called a *very great journey* from Judæa to Rome.

From Socrates, E. H. ii. xx. 102. A. it appears that a year and six months was not thought too long an interval, within which to notify to the bishops of the East, the holding of a council at Serdica, in Illyricum, and to bring them thither by the time appointed, A. D. 347.

Chrysostom was seventy days in making the journey from Constantinople to Cucusus, the place of his banishment, on the borders of Armenia Minor and Cilicia Campestris, under Mount Amanus. Yet he had but to travel along Asia Minor, from west to east, and he made the journey in the middle of the summer : Vide Operum iii. 729. B. Epistola 234. The body of Theodosius, who died at Milan, January 17, A. D. 395, did not arrive at Constantinople, in order to be buried there, before November 8. in the same year ; nor the army, which had accompanied Theodosius into Italy, before November 27 : Socrates, E. H. v. xxvi. 295. C. and vi. i. 299. D. 300. A.

If any one will take the trouble to follow the journey of Paula from Rome to Jerusalem, as related by Jerome, Opera, iv. Pars 2^{da}, 672 *ad princip.* : it will appear that though she set out, *exacta hyeme, aperto mari* ; and travelled by the usual route, without being detained, as far as can be collected from the account, except for *ten* days at Cyprus, yet it was *media hyeme* that she departed from Antioch for Judæa.

Lastly, with regard to my assertion, (page 306. vol. i.) that the journey from Judæa to Rome, even in

the summer time, would require an interval of *six* weeks and upwards, I shall conclude these citations with the following passage from Theodorit: In Coloss. ii. 17: Operum iii. 489.

Καλῶς δὲ προστέθεικε καὶ τὸ ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἠδύναντο ταύτας πληροῦν. πῶς γὰρ οἶόν τε ἦν τρὶς τοῦ ἔτους ἀπὸ τῆς Φρυγίας εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν τρέχειν, ἢ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπιτελέσωσι κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὰς ἑορτὰς, καὶ μάλιστα τῆς πεντηκοστῆς πελαζούσης τῷ πάσχα; πλειόνων γάρ ἐστιν ἢ πεντήκοντα ἡμερῶν ὁδός. That this computation is no exaggerated statement, may be fairly collected from what is asserted by Evagrius, E. H. i. iii. 258. D. 259. A. respecting the distance of Ephesus in particular from Antioch; which he estimates at as nearly as possible thirty days' journey. The regular course of the journey from Ephesus to Jerusalem by land would lie through Antioch.

The remark in question occurs with reference to the absence of the bishop of Antioch from the council of Ephesus, A. D. 431. The case of this bishop, and the time taken up by his journey from his own see to the place of the meeting of the council, is an instance in point. The council condemned Nestorius, June 28. A. D. 431. according to Socrates, E. H. vii. xxxiv. 377. B; and John, bishop of Antioch, with his suffragans, according to Evagrius, i. v. 260. B. did not arrive until five days after: though according to the same authority, i. iii. 259. A. they had made such haste to set out immediately after Easter, that they had not stayed to celebrate τὴν καλουμένην νέαν κυριακὴν, in their respective sees and churches. The νέα κυριακή in question denotes the first Sunday after Easter: see the Annotations of Valesius, *in loco*.

It seems, then, that John and his suffragan bishops had set out before the first Sunday after Easter. The

council was appointed to meet at Pentecost; and actually did so: yet John and his bishops did not arrive until five days after the condemnation of Nestorius, according to Evagrius, and fifteen days after the time appointed for the meeting of the council, according to the same authority, i. iv. 259. B. They had consequently been eight or nine weeks on the road.

It is observable in particular, that Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, according to Socrates, vii. xxxiv. 376. B. arrived five days after Pentecost: so that, even supposing him to have set out in the second week after Easter, he had yet been six weeks on the road.

An instance indeed occurs in Procopius, *De Bello Persico*, in which the period of seventy days was appointed for the going and returning of a messenger from the banks of the Tigris near Nisibis, to Byzantium. But this was in the case of an ambassador carrying proposals of peace from the Persian king, Chosroes, to the Roman emperor Justinian; who would travel with proportionably greater dispatch. See Procopius, *De Bello Persico*, i. 22. 111. l. 3—112. l. 11, 12: 19, 20. Nisibis was but two days' journey distant from the Tigris: see cap. 11. p. 54. l. 17.

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION IX.

On the natural or physical Notices of Time, supplied by the Gospel Histories.

Vide Dissertation x. vol. i. page 366. line 7.

IN any historical work which might omit to specify the times of particular events, one of the simplest and most obvious methods of supplying this defect, would be by the help of allusions to the usual phenomena of nature, which we know to be restricted to certain seasons of the year; were any such to be met with therein. For example, it is not stated by Thucydides in what month of the Attic year the first invasion of Attica by the Peloponnesians took place; but it is mentioned that they entered the country, τοῦ σίτου ἀκμάζοντος ^a, that is, when the corn was ripe, or beginning to ripen. The time of the invasion then is determined to the spring quarter of the year: and if we knew that the grain in Attica was commonly ripe in such and such a month; July for example or August; we might infer that the invasion took place in May or June. In like manner, when we read in the book of Exodus ^b, that the flax and the barley were both destroyed by the plague of hail, because *the barley was in the ear* and *the flax was bolled*, but that the wheat and the rie were not smitten, because they were still in the blade, or as some commentators understand it, *still in*

^a ii. 19. Cf. iv. 1. περὶ σίτου ἐκβολήν: on which Suidas Σίτου, observes, Καὶ σίτου ἐκβολήν Θουκυδίδης, ὅταν ὁ στάχυς τῆς κάλυκος ἐκφύηται, οὐχ ὅταν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἀναδιδῶται τὰ σπέρματα.

^b Exod. ix. 31, 32.

the ground; the time of this plague, we might collect, was about the period of the vernal equinox; by which time the flax and the barley in Egypt, if not fully ripe, are commonly in a very forward state. Again, when the spies on their return from searching the land of Canaan, brought with them a ripe bunch of grapes, and other autumnal fruits^c; this fact too is sufficient to prove that the Israelites approached the borders of Canaan, on the first occasion, forty days before the beginning of the autumnal quarter, at least.

But it is unnecessary to multiply instances of a similar kind. The determination of the date of the celebrated battle of Pharsalia turns mainly on the decision of this question; viz. at what time the corn was usually ripe in Thessaly. I will observe only that the distinction of the course of events into *summers* and *winters*, for the purpose of history, is not only one of the most ancient modes of distributing time, but one which continued to be observed long after the origin of regular history. Pausanias informs us that Rhianus, the poetical historian of the second Messenian war, expressed its duration by so many summers and winters^d; and even Thucydides, though writing at a period of great refinement, still makes use of this simple and natural method, for distinguishing and arranging chronologically the events of the Peloponnesian war.

A narrative like that of our Saviour's ministry, which descends so minutely into particulars of everyday occurrence, could scarcely fail to contain occasional notices of these ordinary phenomena of nature; which, if they were sufficiently numerous to be collected into one body, and sufficiently independent of each other,

^c Numbers xiii. 23.

^d οὐρεος ἀργεννοῦ περὶ πτύχας ἐστρατόωντο, χεῖματά τε πόλεις τε δύο καὶ εἴκοσι πάσας.

Messenica, lib. iv. 17.

to be distinguished asunder, would furnish so many plain and intelligible criterions for ascertaining the duration of the gospel ministry, with more or less of precision. It is surprising, therefore, that no commentator, or harmonist, so far as I know, has yet thought of bringing them together, and arguing from them *seriatim*: especially as the inference to which they lead possesses the force of a demonstration, and is one of which the lowest capacity is as competent to judge, as the highest. It requires no learning or penetration to be enabled to see that the ordinary appearances of nature must belong to their proper seasons of the year: and no great effort of reasoning to draw the conclusion that between two different springs or two different summers, there can never be less than one year's interval, though there possibly may be more.

It is my intention to confine myself at present, as much as possible, to the simple consideration of the notices in question; without taking into account a single mark of time, which is not supplied by the incidental mention of some natural phenomenon or other. But I would have the reader to observe that this is done *ex abundanti*; and because, for the object which we have in view, these notices will be found sufficient. The force of the argument which I propose to found on such incidental allusions, will be best appreciated if it is kept single and distinct: though these indirect notes of time do admit of being illustrated and confirmed by others of a more direct kind. And as it is of no consequence to the final result, in what order they are considered, I shall take the liberty of tracing them backwards; or of beginning with the latest first.

If one, then, who was as yet a stranger to the particulars of the gospel history, were to read in St. Matthew's Gospel, xxi. 8, or St. Mark's, xi. 8. that, on

some occasion, when Jesus was approaching to Jerusalem, the multitude cut down branches, and strewed them in the way: or if he were to see it related in St. John's, xii. 13. how the people of Jerusalem, hearing that Jesus was coming to their city from Bethany, took boughs of palms in their hands, and went out to meet him: he would naturally conclude that these were *green* branches; and therefore, that the time of the year was either spring or summer.

If he were further to read either in Matt. xxiv. 32, or in Mark, xiii. 28. or in Luke, xxi. 29, 30. that Jesus, a day or two later than the preceding events, while discoursing with his disciples, drew their attention to the *fig-tree, and the rest of the trees*, as already in leaf, and giving promise of the approach of summer; he would find his former conclusion so much the more confirmed.

But if he were also to observe in Matt. xxi. 19. or Mark, xi. 13. that, at a time between these two events, mention occurred of a certain fig-tree, which was forward enough to be full of leaves, but not forward enough to have fruit upon it; he could not hesitate to infer that the season of the year must have been exactly the beginning of spring: that had it been earlier, the tree in question would not have been in full leaf; and had it been later it would most probably have been able to furnish fruit.

All these events, then, which the reader would easily perceive to be connected together, and to form what are called the particulars of Passion week; if there were no other means of discovering the time of the year when they happened, would still be determined to the beginning of the spring quarter; that is, neither much earlier, nor much later, than the vernal equinox. There would consequently be proof of *one* spring in

the course of the gospel history; which proof would be furnished by the history of the proceedings in Passion week.

If after this the same person were to find it mentioned, Matt. xiv. 19. or Mark, vi. 39. or John, vi. 10. in the account of a miracle which he would plainly perceive was one and the same event in all these relations; that there was *grass* in the place where the miracle took effect; and *grass* still *green*; and *grass* not only *green* but *in abundance*: he would naturally infer that as this miracle came to pass while there was still an abundance of green grass on the ground, the *vernal* freshness and the *vernal* luxuriancy of the season must be that characteristic of the time, which was there meant.

If so, he would see proof in this instance also of *another* spring; which must have been either the same with that already discovered, or different from it. A very slight perusal of the intermediate history would satisfy him that it could not possibly have been the same; and consequently, that it must have been distinct. The miracle of feeding the five thousand must have happened in the spring of *one* year; and the proceedings in Passion week in the *spring* of another. One year of the gospel ministry, at least, would consequently thus be accounted for: for between two different springs there could not be less than a twelve-month's interval, though there might be more.

It may be said, however, that the circumstance of green grass being to be found in abundance at the time of this miracle, would not necessarily imply that it was performed in the spring. Green grass might perhaps be found in abundance, when the year was more advanced; during the summer, or even in the autumnal quarter.

In answer to this objection, it is necessary to remind the reader of the natural peculiarities of Judæa ; and of other hot countries in the East. In our own climate, and wheresoever else the recurrence of rain, or fine weather, is irregularly dispensed, the fields may be clothed with their natural verdure, more or less luxuriantly, at any season of the year, except the depth of winter. But the case is not so with Judæa, and the neighbouring regions. It must be familiar to every one, who has read the Old or New Testament with the least attention, that among the different modes of describing what is notoriously shortlived and transient, nothing is more common than allusions to the grass, or the flowers of the field^e. The foundation of these allusions is a well known fact in the natural history of those countries ; that not only the flowers, but the very verdure or grass of the fields, was peculiarly liable to speedy decay.

The truth is, as I have had occasion to shew in the present work, the season of rain in Judæa is confined for the most part to the autumn and the spring^f. The autumnal rains commonly set in about the end of October or the beginning of November : the vernal rains as commonly terminated about the end of March, or the beginning of April. From October to April, then, or for a period of five or six months, green grass, it may be said, is to be found in Judæa. But in a very short time after the termination of the vernal rains, the sun becomes so powerful there as to burn up and scorch the face of the ground ; which, being no longer refreshed by rains, gradually withers away, and at last becomes stript of its verdure. It is, therefore, with

^e Job xiv. 2. Isaiah xxxvii. 27. xl. 6. 7. 8. Psalm cii. 11. ciii. 15. cxxix. 6. 7. Matt. vi. 30. Luke xii. 28. James i. 10. 11. 1 Pet. i. 24.

^f Vide Dissertation xxxiv. vol. iii. 13—22.

singular propriety, as we may observe by the way, that in our Saviour's parable of the sower, the seed which fell upon shallow ground, as it was represented speedily to spring up, so was supposed speedily to pine away^g. The sun had no sooner risen upon it, that is, the sun when it had begun to grow warm and powerful, before it drooped and expired beneath the heat.

It was an infallible consequence of the dry season, after it had set in, that the water courses were soon exhausted; and the people were reduced to depend upon the supplies laid up in their cisterns. Jerome, ad Amos iv. observes, *Prohibuit autem imbrem, ut non solum indigentiam panum, sed et sitis ardorem et bibendi penuriam sustinerent. in his enim locis, in quibus nunc degimus, præter parvos fontes, omnes cisternarum aquæ sunt: et si imbres divina ira suspenderit, magis sitis quam famis periculum est*^h. In Jerem. xiv: *Putandumque est, obsidionis tempore pluvias non fuisse, ut sterilitatem obsessi sustinerent aquæ. uno quippe fonte Siloe, et hoc non perpetuo, utitur civitas: et usque in præsentem diem; sterilitas pluviarum non solum frugum, sed et bibendi inopiam facit*ⁱ.

It happened, too, in some years that not only the heat and drought, but the periodical visitation of locusts and caterpillars, contributed to the speedy destruction of the natural verdure of the ground. So Jerome, in Amos vii: after speaking of the appearance of the locust, which commonly came with the beginning of the latter or vernal rain, when every thing was most luxuriant; proceeds to describe it as followed by that of the caterpillar^k. *Has autem locustas, quæ primo Vere volitabant, bruchus innumerabilis sequebatur, qui veniebat post imbrem serotinum, et appella-*

^g Matt. xiii. 5. 6. Mark iv. 5. 6. Luke viii. 6.
ad medium.

ⁱ Ibid. 595. ad medium.

^h Opera, iii. 1401.
^k Ibid. 1432. ad principium.

batur tonsor, vel tonsura regis; eo quod universa vastaverit, et nihil penitus reliquerit herbæ virentis in terra.

The country being thus dried up, there was consequently no green pasture to be found for cattle; which, in defect thereof, were supported on hay, and straw or stubble. So Jerome, in Isai. xxv: Hoc juxta ritum loquitur Palæstinæ et multarum Orientis provinciarum: quæ ob pratorum et fœni penuriam, paleas præparant esui animantium¹: and Philo Judæus, De Josepho: τετάρτου δὲ, τοῦ καὶ τοῖς θρέμμασι χιλὸν τεταμιεύσθαι, τῶν ἀχύρων καὶ ἀθέρων ἐκ τῆς τοῦ καρποῦ καθάρσεως διακρινομένων^m. Cf. also Gen. xxiv. 25. 32: the time of which transaction was obviously the middle of summer.

The following passages from Maimonides, De rebus altari interdictisⁿ, will sufficiently prove that it was well understood in Judæa, up to what time the cattle might be fed upon *green* food; and when it became necessary to support them upon *dry*.

Ex oculis bestię distillans aqua tum denique cognoscebatur esse perpetua, cum ab Kalendis mensis Adar ad Idus Nisan *herbis viridibus* bestia, et *siccis* ab Kalendis Elul ad Idus Tisri pasta, non convalesceret.

Tribus igitur mensibus quotidie bestia ex herbis *viridibus* et *siccis*, suo quibusque tempore, edebat ad magnitudinem fici, aut eo plus, idque ante primum pastum, post potum. &c.

Ut si ex præscripto *virides* herbas mense Adar toto, et dimidio mense Nisan comederit, reliquoque dimidio mense Nisan, et toto mense Iier *siccas* herbas, tribus videlicet continuis mensibus: si ex herbis comederit

¹ Operum iii. 215. ad calcem.
§. 13. 14. 15.

^m Operum ii. 57. l. 39.

ⁿ Cap. ii.

. nam quæ ex præscripto herbas suo tempore comedisset, nec sanata fuerit, hæc sane vitio laborabat perpetuo *.

These quotations distinctly prove that, generally speaking, green pasture was no longer to be had after the fifteenth of Nisan, which in a rectified year would correspond very nearly to the fifteenth of April, on the one hand ; nor before the first of Adar, which on the same principle would answer to the first of March, on the other. This is enough to shew with what rapidity, after the termination of the vernal rains, the country was usually dried up. It is accordingly very observable that at the time of the next miracle of feeding ; though it happened on the same locality as the former, and though the people were made to sit down on the ground *then* as well as *before* ; yet there is no mention made of grass. That second miracle took place when the season was considerably more advanced ; and when the verdure of the fields had been long scorched up. The absence, then, of such an allusion upon the latter occasion, is just as natural and characteristic a circumstance, as its presence upon the former.

Whether the effect of the autumnal rains was to cause the grass to spring again, and to restore the face of the ground, does not so clearly appear ; though the

* According to Mr. Harmer, (vol. ii. Chap. x. Observ. xxxvi. 466—469.) at Aleppo the cattle are now turned out to feed at the time when the people repair to the gardens ; that is, in April and May. The Jewish rabbis say the time when this was done in Judæa was about the Passover. The Arabs, according to D'Arvieux, turn out their horses to grass in March.

Dr. Shaw and all other modern travellers report that hay is never, or very seldom, made in the East. The cattle are fed on cut straw. See Mr. Harmer, i. Chap. iii. Observation viii. p. 176. note. Cf. 423. Chap. v. Observation iii. The same thing appears not only from Genesis xxiv. 25. 32. but from Judges xix. 19. which also was evidently in the summer season.

negative is most probable *. But even to admit that it was so; still we may argue as follows: Did the miracle in question take place not longer after the commencement of the *autumnal* rains, than would suffice to revive the country; or not longer after the termination of the *vernal*, than while the natural freshness and luxuriance of the fields continued unimpaired? If we adopt the latter supposition, then the interval of time between the miracle in question and the proceedings in Passion week, becomes *one* year at least. If we adopt the former, then, unless it can be shewn that the miracle happened in the autumnal quarter, which immediately preceded the proceedings in Passion week, this interval becomes five or six months more.

But this last supposition never can be shewn to hold good: on the contrary, it is plainly refuted by the gospel narrative itself. The same evangelist, St. John, who mentions most distinctly the characteristic circumstance of the grass, tells us, vii. 1, that after *this* miracle *Jesus walked in Galilee*; and *then*, attended a feast of Tabernacles, vii. 2: and after *that*, x. 22, a feast of Dedication: which things could not have happened in any such order, if the miracle had come to pass *between* the feast of Tabernacles and the feast of Dedication, in the autumnal quarter before the last Passover; as it must have done, if it happened after the commencement of the autumnal, and not the vernal rains in question. The autumnal rains never set in *before* the feast of Tabernacles, but always *after* it.

After this one objection, it is needless to state any further arguments against the same supposition; though

* The Jewish writers (Mr. H. ut supra) state accordingly that on the falling of the first rains the herds were brought home. This would be before the end of October at the latest.

many might be derived from the order and succession of the particulars recorded by the other evangelists. We have restricted ourselves also from noticing any indications of time, at present, except the natural ones: or St. John would enable us to decide upon the question at once, by referring to vi. 4. of his Gospel; which tells us that, when the miracle was performed, the Passover was nigh at hand. No reader of the Old or New Testament requires to be informed, that the Passover was a *spring* feast; not a *summer*, or an *autumnal* one.

It is more to the purpose to observe that, according to Jerome, the appearance of things in Judæa, between the feast of Tabernacles and that of Dedication, and much more at any later period, until the recurrence of the vernal equinox, would not agree to the circumstances of the picture drawn in the Gospels^o: Octavus apud Hebræos mensis, qui apud illos Maresvan, apud Ægyptios Athir, apud nos November dicitur, hyemis exordium est: in quo . . . omnis terra virore nudatur, et mortalium corpora contrahuntur. And again^p: Mensis autem undecimus, qui appellatur Sabat . . . est in acerrimo tempore hyemis, qui ab Ægyptiis Mechir, a Macedonibus Περίτιος, a Romanis Februarius appellatur. The inclemency of the weather in the month of November or December, would be a serious objection to the supposition of Jesus' having been, at that time, in the open air by night; and attended by such multitudes. At the feast of Encænia, when St. John tells us it was winter^q, he was walking in Solomon's porch, under cover. The feast of Encænia began on the 25th of the ninth month Casleu, answering in a rectified year to December: and there is an instance in the book of Ezra, when, on the twentieth of that month, the peo-

^o Opera, iii. 1707. *ad calcem*: in Zach. i. ^p Ibid. 1709. *ad calcem*. ^q x. 22.

ple were unable to remain out of doors, because of the cold and the rain^r *.

To resume, therefore, the prosecution of our subject. If the reader were to look a little further, he would find at Matt. xii. 1. Mark ii. 23. Luke vi. 1. an account, that on some occasion, when Jesus and his disciples were walking through the fields of corn, the latter, being an hungered, began to pluck the ears, and to eat them, as they went along; rubbing out the grain with their hands. He would find it mentioned also that this incident happened on a sabbath, to which St. Luke gives the peculiar name of *σάββατον δευτερό-πρωτον*. The explanation of this mode of speaking may require both learning and pains: but it requires neither learning nor pains, to be enabled to comprehend that if the disciples were plucking and eating the standing corn, the standing corn was fit to be plucked and eaten; and consequently that harvest, if not yet come, was near at hand.

As, however, there are two principal sorts of grain, barley and wheat—which in Judæa do not arrive at maturity together; it may at first sight be doubtful which of the two kinds of harvest is here meant. But whosoever is aware that, by the original appointment of the law, the first fruits of barley harvest were every year to be consecrated at the Passover, and those of wheat harvest at the feast of Pentecost, will naturally conclude, that barley harvest every year would be ripe about the Passover, and wheat harvest about Pen-

* The truth is, according to the report of modern observations, that the severity of winter for the meridian of Judæa may be reckoned to begin about Dec. 12, and to last until Ja-

nuary 20: during which time the rains are extremely violent, there is both frost and snow, and the coldness of the weather, especially at night, is peculiarly bitter and pinching.

tecost: between which there never could be more, nor less, than seven weeks' interval. The author of the book of Enoch, a Jew of Palestine, gives this description of the vernal quarter, as such, viz. the interval between the vernal equinox, and, as he supposes, the ninety-first day afterwards: In the days of his influence *there is* perspiration, heat, and trouble. All the trees become fruitful; the leaf of every tree comes forth; the *corn is reaped*; the rose and every species of flower blossoms in the field^s. Philo Judæus, in various places, speaks to the like effect: τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἐαρινῆς ἰσημερίας πρῶτον ἀναγράφει μῆνα Μωϋσῆς ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἐνιαυτῶν περιόδοις, ἀναθεῖς, οὐχ ὥσπερ ἔνιοι, χρόνῳ τὰ πρεσβεῖα μᾶλλον, ἢ ταῖς τῆς φύσεως χάρισιν, ἃς ἀνέτειλεν ἀνθρώποις. κατὰ γὰρ ταύτην τὰ μὲν σπαρτὰ, ἡ ἀναγκαία τροφή, τελειογονεῖται· ὁ δὲ τῶν δένδρων καρπὸς ἡβώντων ἄρτι γεννᾶται, δευτέραν ἔχων τάξιν· ὅθεν καὶ ὀψίγονός ἐστιν^t: κ', τ. λ. Cf. 206. l. 30. De Decem Oraculis: ἐβδομάδι δὲ τὰς μεγίστας . . . οὓς καὶ τὰ δένδρα ἤνεγκεν—239. l. 26. De Animalibus Sacrificio idoneis: κατὰ τὸν λόγον τῶν ἰσημεριῶν . . . ἐν ᾧ καιρῷ πάλιν ἀρχὴ σπορᾶς—293. l. 30. De Septenario et Festis Diebus: ὁ δ' ἄρτος ἄζυμος . . . μήπω καιρὸν ἐχόντων εἰς ἄμητον.

De Justitia^u: παρ' ὃ καὶ ἡ φύσις οὐχὶ τὴν αὐτὴν προθεσμίαν ἀμφοτέροις ὥρισεν, εἰς τὴν τῶν ἐτησίων καρπῶν γένεσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς μὲν εἰς ἄμητον ὥραν ἀπένειμε τὸ ἔαρ, τοῖς δ' εἰς συγκομιδὴν ἀκροδρῶν λήγον θέρος. συμβαίνει γοῦν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον, τὰ μὲν ἀφαινεσθαι προανθήσαντα, τὰ δὲ βλαστάνειν προαφανανθέντα. χειμῶνι μὲν γὰρ, φυλλορροοῦντων δένδρων, τὰ σπαρτὰ ἀνθεῖ· ἔαρ δὲ, κατὰ τοῦναντίον, αὐαινομένων ὅσα σπαρτὰ, βλαστάνουσιν αἱ δένδρων ἡμέρων τε καὶ ἀγρίων ὕλαι.

Whichever harvest, then, we suppose to be meant,

^s Ch. lxxxii 18.

^t Opera, ii. 169. l. 2. De Mose, lib. 3.

^u Ibid. 370. 37.

and consequently whichever feast to be current or just past, yet between the time when the disciples were eating the ears of corn, and that when Jesus was feeding the five thousand; both being determined to the spring quarter of the year; twelve months' interval, at least, must have transpired: and, consequently, between the same time and the proceedings in Passion week, twenty-four months' or two years' interval, at least. Nor is it possible to undermine this conclusion, by endeavouring to diminish the interval in question. The only supposition which might be made for that purpose would be most preposterous and absurd; viz. that, peradventure the feeding of the five thousand took place a little before the Passover, at the beginning of the vernal quarter, and the walking through the corn fields at the feast of Pentecost, a little before its close. For on this principle the former event must have preceded the latter, and by a very short time too: whereas in reality it happened after it; and with a great number of incidents between them, some of which would require several months in order to be transacted.

Jesus fed the five thousand, the day after he retired from Capernaum, apart with the twelve: he retired with the twelve soon after their return from their mission: they were sent upon that mission after a circuit of Galilee, which was begun from Nazareth: Jesus went to Nazareth soon after his return to Capernaum, from his first visit to Gadara: he went to Gadara on the evening of the day when he first began to teach in parables: he began to teach in parables, soon after his return to Capernaum from a circuit of Galilee, which began at Nain: he went to Nain the day after the ordination of the twelve: he ordained the twelve at the close of a partial circuit, about the land of Gennesaret

and the lake of Galilee : he set out upon that circuit in consequence of the cure of the man with the withered hand : he wrought that cure on some sabbath day *after* the very sabbath, in which the disciples had walked through the fields, and eaten of the ears of corn^x. To proceed, then.

If the reader continues his perusal, he will find at John iv. 35. another reference to a natural phenomenon, which is as distinct as any of the preceding. Οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε· Ὅτι ἔτι τετράμηνόν ἐστι, καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται; ἰδοὺ, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν, καὶ θεάσασθε τὰς χώρας, ὅτι λευκαὶ εἰσι πρὸς θερισμὸν ἤδη. Whatsoever figurative meaning may be couched under this literal description, yet as even symbolical representations must have some foundation in reality, I would ask a person of common capacity, and common sense, to what he supposed our Lord was referring *primarily* and *obviously*, in such language as this? Could he possibly answer, that he was alluding to any thing but the actual forwardness of the harvest, the actual whiteness of the fields; which every one knows to be their natural appearance when the corn is fully ripe? We have nothing to do with the allusion to seed time; though that also admits of an easy explanation : the stress of the argument turns upon the allusion to the colour of the corn : which is a decisive criterion that, when the words were spoken, the harvest was near at hand. But I have already considered the passage elsewhere, and as I think, have said enough there to shew that, notwithstanding its metaphorical application to something still future, it contains a plain and significant reference to an actual present truth^y : which renders it unnecessary for me to dwell any longer upon it here.

^x Matt. xii. 9. Mark iii. 1. Luke vi. 6.

^y Dissertation xxi. vol. ii. 222—229.

Until, then, it can be proved that our Lord is alluding in the *first* place to any but the natural harvest, or that he would talk of the fields being *white* against any harvest but that; I shall take the liberty of understanding him in this obvious sense: and consequently, shall infer that we have an indication of the spring or the summer season in this passage, as well as in the last considered. Is this season, then, the same as in the former instance? or is the harvest, now at hand, that at which the disciples plucked the ears of corn? This could not be the case, unless both were the barley harvest, or both were the wheat harvest, in the same year: and either of these suppositions would carry with it its own refutation. For when *this* incident happened in St. John, Jesus had only just begun his ministry in Judæa, and had not yet begun it in Galilee at all: when *that* happened in the other evangelists, it had been going on in the latter country a long while. *This* then is an incident at the very outset of his ministry, when he was on his way into Galilee itself, intending to commence his ministry *there*: *that* is an event, sometime in the midst of its career: so that it is impossible that they could be synchronous events.

Let us make, however, all the allowance that we can: let us suppose that the harvest alluded to in St. John, is *barley harvest*; and that alluded to in the other evangelists is *wheat harvest*; both in the same year. I say nothing of the absurdity of supposing the Passover to be over, and yet barley harvest to be still to come. I shall wave this objection; and merely ask, What time would there be, on the hypothesis in question, for the events related by St. John, before Jesus came into Galilee after the imprisonment of the Baptist: his continuance at Jerusalem, during the

Passover—his residence in Judæa, for a longer or a shorter time, after it—his journey through Samaria, and two days' residence at Sychar? What, for the events related by St. John or by the other evangelists, after the arrival in Galilee: the second visit to Cana—the miracle in Capernaum—the visit to Nazareth—the settling at Capernaum—the call of the four disciples—the first general circuit of Galilee, and the several remaining particulars, which are on record—down to the call and the feast of Levi: which are the last things mentioned before the incident relating to the corn? That each of these things could have come to pass in its relative order, within five or six weeks' time, which is the utmost we should be able to assign to them; is almost physically impossible. One only of the number, the first general circuit of Galilee, most probably occupied more than twice the supposed period of time. And besides this, there was a retirement of our Lord's into the desert, or less populous parts of the country, which came between the cure of the leper, and that of the paralytic: and though its duration is not specified, it must have been of considerable extent; for it is the only incident, which we have on record, to fill up the interval between the time of the cure of the leper, and the close of our Lord's first year; an interval which I apprehend to have been of several months in duration. In short, to attempt to compress within the limits of five or six weeks, a series of events, which really extended from the first Passover to the end of our Lord's first year, is manifestly preposterous and absurd.

Besides the leading and characteristic indications of time, which have thus been pointed out, there are others of a subordinate description, which might also be mentioned. But as these minor notices come be-

tween the principal ones, though they might serve to distribute and distinguish the order of intermediate events, they would not be so useful for establishing such comprehensive divisions of the whole length of our Saviour's ministry, as its integral periods or years. To sum up, therefore, the results of the preceding survey.

Two evidences of harvest time, and two of spring time—each in a distinct year—which we have discovered—even if they belonged to four successive years, would yet imply an intermediate duration, from first to last, of three complete years at least. The method, therefore, which we have adopted to ascertain the length of our Saviour's ministry, has enabled us to determine its *minimum*, but not its *maximum*; viz. that it could not have lasted less than three years' time, though it might have lasted more. But upon this particular question the determination of such a minimum is equivalent to that of a maximum. No harmonist, or commentator, I conceive, would see reason to extend the duration of our Lord's ministry beyond this period of three years, even though the necessity of the case might oblige him to admit that it must have lasted so long. And when we consider that the opinion which restricts its duration to the term of a single year, or of one year, and a few months of a second; is one which comes recommended by a prescription of very remote antiquity, and by the sanction of modern harmonists and commentators of great celebrity; if the above considerations did no more than expose the falsehood of this particular notion, in a manner so plain and intelligible to every one's capacity, as I trust they have now done, they would still render an essential service to the cause of truth in general, and to the business of a gospel harmonist in particular.

I began with an admonition to the reader, that I proposed to confine myself solely to one class of the indications of time, which the gospel history might furnish. That he may see, however, what other arguments the same history supplies, conspiring with the above in the results to which they lead, he may refer to the tenth, the eleventh, the twelfth, the fifteenth, the nineteenth, the twenty-first, the twenty-third, the thirtieth, the thirty-first, and the thirty-fourth of my Dissertations: to which the present must be considered supplementary. As these various modes of resolving the same problem, which is the duration of our Saviour's ministry, are entirely independent of each other, and yet agree precisely in the same result; it becomes a natural inference that they coincide in one result, only because they coincide with the truth. On any other supposition but that, the chances of a coincidence between them would be precarious indeed.

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION X.

On the time of the imprisonment of John the Baptist, and of the marriage of Herod and Herodias.

BOTH the abovementioned facts are attested by Josephus; but in conjunction with another event, the war between Herod and Aretas, which arose out of the marriage in question. The place of this war in the Antiquities is undoubtedly towards the very close of the reign of Tiberius. For Tiberius, having heard of the defeat of Herod, had written to Vitellius the president of Syria, to give him orders to punish Aretas^a; and Vitellius was on his way to execute these orders when he received in Jerusalem at the time of some feast^b, (which the context demonstrates to have been the Pentecost of U. C. 790.) the news of the death of Tiberius; which death took place on the 16th of March in that year. These particulars are attested in general by Philo^c.

It would seem to follow from this representation, that the imprisonment of John, and the marriage of Herod and Herodias, must have coincided with the last year of the reign of Tiberius. It may be proved, however, even from the testimony of Josephus, that this was not the case.

First; the construction which the nation at large put upon the defeat of Herod, as a judgment for the death of John^d, proves nothing upon the point in

^a xviii. v. 1.
De Virtutibus.

^b Ibid. 3.

^c Operum ii. 580. l. 20—25: 588. l. 10—20.

^d Ant. Jud. xviii. v. 2.

question. Between the twelfth and the twenty-third of Tiberius, until this very rupture with Aretas, there was no war, nor misfortune of any kind, affecting either Herod or any other of his family, on which such a construction could have been put. This then was the first incident of the kind.

The defeat of Herod is ascribed to the treachery of certain exiles belonging to the tetrarchy of his brother Philip, who were serving at that time in his army^e. Upon the death of Philip, in the first half of U. C. 787. his tetrarchy was annexed to Syria^f. He was alive then at the time of this battle: and still in possession of his tetrarchy. The battle therefore could not have been fought before the first half of U. C. 787. at the latest.

John the Baptist was both imprisoned and put to death in Machærus^g: Machærus therefore both at his imprisonment, and at his death, must have been in the possession of Herod. But when the daughter of Aretas made her escape, she fled to Machærus, τότε πατρὶ ἀντὴς ὑποτελεῇ^h. Between the time then of the imprisonment and the death of John, and the time of this escape, Machærus had passed out of the hands of Herod into the hands of Aretas. Nor was this an improbable event; for it stood upon the confines of their territories respectively; and even before the time of this flight, they were involved in a dispute, relating to their separate jurisdictions, in the course of which forces had been levied on either side*.

* To these forces, on the part at least of Herod, I would refer the allusion to καὶ στρατευόμενοι, persons who were then serving as soldiers, Luke iii. 14, at the

outset of the ministry of John; though, from Ant. xviii. vii. 2. it may be collected that Herod must have kept up at all times a kind of standing army.

^e Ant. Jud. xviii. v. 1.

^f xviii. iv. 6.

^g xviii. v. 2.

^h Ibid. 1.

It is evident from the Gospel account, that, at the time of the death of the Baptist, the daughter of Herodias was living with her mother; and was consequently still unmarried. Josephus bears witness that Herodias, by her first husband Herod Μαριάμνης, had a daughter called Salome; who was not yet married at the time of her mother's separation from her father, but was married after it; first to her father's brother, Philip the tetrarch; and again, upon his death, to her cousin Aristobulus, son of Herod of Chalcis her mother's brotherⁱ. Now Salome could not have been married to Philip after the twentieth of Tiberius; but she might be before it. Consequently, her mother could not have been separated from her first husband after the same year; but she might have been before it.

The Gospel accounts also imply that this daughter was not merely unmarried, but still a young girl, at the time of the death of John. Both St. Matthew and St. Mark call her κοράσιον—the same term which each of them applies to the daughter of Jairus; who was certainly not more than twelve years of age. The age of puberty in females, according to the Jewish law, was twelve years and a day, or nominally thirteen years; and the same age at Rome, according to Dio, was also fixed at twelve^k. I think, then, that this term would not be applied to any one after thirteen or fourteen years of age. From fourteen to sixteen was a common age of marriage, both in Greece, and in Rome, and in Judæa*. Let us suppose, then, that

* Γρῆν ἐγγιμε Φιλίνος, ὅτ' ἦν νέος· ἥνικα πρέσβυς | δωδεκέτιν Παφίη δ' ὄριος οὐδέποτε. Anthologia, ii. 175. Leonidæ Alexandrini vii. Τὰν στάλαν ἐχάραξε

Βιάνωρ, οὐκ ἐπὶ ματρὶ, | οὐδ' ἐπὶ τῷ γενέτῃ, πότμον ὀφειλόμενον· | παρθενικῇ δ' ἐπὶ παιδί. κατέστεινε δ', οὐχ Ὑμεναίῳ, | ἀλλ' Ἀἰδᾷ νύμφαν δωδεκέτιν κατὰγων. Ibid. 182.

ⁱ Ant. Jud. xviii. v. 4.

^k liv. 16.

Salome was married to Philip in the fifteenth year of her age. She had no children by Philip; but three sons by her next husband. We may infer, therefore, that she was married to him not long before his death. Let us suppose they were married in the eighteenth of Tiberius. If Salome was fifteen in the eighteenth of his reign, she would be eleven in the fourteenth; when John the Baptist was put to death.

Herodias, the mother of Salome, was betrothed to her first husband, Herod the son of the second Mariamne^o, as I shewed before^p, in U. C. 749: when she was probably two years old. And that this match was consummated accordingly we have the assurance of Josephus^q; and there is no reason whatever to call the fact in question. The marriage of Herod and the second Mariamne, we have seen^r, was placed by Jose-

Ejusdem xxxviii. Λέκτρα σοι ἀντὶ γάμων ἐπιτύμβια, παρθένε κούρη, | ἐστόρεσαν παλάμαις πενθαλαίαις γενέ-
ται. | καὶ σὺ μὲν ἀμπλακίας βίотου καὶ μόχθου Ἐλευθοῦς | ἔκφυγες· οἱ δὲ γόων πικρὸν ἔχουσι νέφος. | δω-
δεκέτιν γὰρ μοῖρα, Μακεδονίη, σε καλύπτει, | κάλλεσιν ὀπλοτέρην, ἥ-
θεσι γηραλέην. Ibid. iv. 73. Pauli Silentarii lxxxiii. ἐπὶ τῇ ἰδίᾳ θυ-
γατρὶ, ἧς ὄνομα Μακεδονία. Non-
dum annos quatuordecim im-
pleverat, . . . jam destinata erat
egregio juveni, jam electus nu-
ptiarum dies¹. Berenice, the
sister of the younger Agrippa,
was sixteen when she was mar-
ried to her uncle Herod of Chal-
cis; and her sister Drusilla was
fifteen or sixteen when she was
married to Azizus^m. If Aristo-
bulus, the brother of the first
Mariamne, was only sixteen

U. C. 717ⁿ. Mariamne his sister,
who was married to Herod the
same year, could not be more
than seventeen; and perhaps
was only fifteen. In like man-
ner it is capable of proof that
Julia, the daughter of Augustus,
was married to her first hus-
band, Marcellus, either in her
fourteenth or her fifteenth year;
Agrippina, the mother of Nero,
was married to Domitius Ahe-
nobarbus at a similar age; Dru-
silla, another of the daughters
of Germanicus, was married to
Cassius Longinus in her six-
teenth year; and Julia, or Li-
villa, her youngest sister, to
Marcus Vinicius in her fifteenth;
and Octavia, the daughter of
Claudius, was married to Nero
in her twelfth. On this subject
cf. Dissertation xii. vol. i. 399.

¹ Pliny, Epistolæ, v. 16.

^m Ant. Jud. xix. ix. 1. xx. vii. 1.

ⁿ xv. ii. 6.

^o De Bello Jud. i. xxviii. 2. Ant. xvii. i. 2.

^p Dissertation xiv. vol. i. 493,

494.

^q Ant. xviii. v. 4.

^r Dissertation v. vol. i. 257, 258.

phus, U.C. 733; in which case no child could have been born from it before U. C. 734. If a child was then born, he would be only fifteen years old, U. C. 749, when Herodias was probably two; and he would be only twenty-nine, U.C. 763, when Herodias was probably sixteen. And the age of thirty was as common an age of marriage for males, as the age of fifteen or sixteen was for females. It is probable, then, that they were married U. C. 763 or 764: and as Herodias had only one child by her first husband, and none, that we read of, by her second, it is very probable that she might not bear even that one child early. If this child was eleven in the fourteenth of Tiberius, she must have been born in the third; which would be seven years after U. C. 763, and six years after U. C. 764. Moreover, if Herodias herself was but sixteen or seventeen, U. C. 763 or 764, three or four years before the first of Tiberius, she would not be more than thirty-two or thirty-three in the twelfth or the thirteenth: at which time she would be still a young woman, and capable of captivating a second husband.

Herod Agrippa, the brother of this Herodias, was educated at Rome, in company with Drusus, the son of Tiberius^s: Berenice his mother, and Antonia the aunt of Drusus, having been intimate friends. Upon the death of Drusus, which happened U. C. 776. Tib. x. *ineunte*, or ix. *exeunte*^t*, the emperor forbade his son's acquaintances his presence; that his grief for his loss might not be renewed by seeing them, and by conversing with them as before. The fact is, that U. C. 779, about midsummer, consequently in the latter half

* There is a coin of this Drusus extant, which proves him to have been alive when he entered on the second year of his Tribunitian authority, some time in U. C. 776. Eckhel, vi. 204.

^s Ant. Jud. xviii. vi. 1.

^t Tacitus, Ann. iv. 8. Dio, lvii. 22. 24.

of his twelfth year, Tiberius retired first to Campania, and ultimately in the course of the next year to Capreæ^u: and this is what Josephus here alludes to.

Agrippa soon after this, being reduced to great distress, retired to Malatha in Idumæa^v. How long he continued there does not appear. But when his difficulties were daily becoming greater, and he was beginning to think of suicide, his wife Cyprus, who had accompanied him, at length represented his state by letter to his sister Herodias—Ἡρώδῃ τῇ τετραράρχῃ συνοικούσῃ.

We have here, then, an intimation that this couple were united in marriage at a time, which may very probably be conjectured as neither earlier than the thirteenth, nor later than the fourteenth or fifteenth of Tiberius; in one or other of which years this application must have been made. My opinion is that it was in the last, U. C. 782, at which time the city of Tiberias, whensoever it began to be built, was now complete; for Agrippa had a dwelling assigned him there, and was made Ἀγορανόμος or Ædile of it. St. John's Gospel, vi. l. 23, at the beginning of our Lord's third year, which was U. C. 782. *ineunte*, clearly supposes the same thing.

Agrippa did not stay long in this dependent situation; and, Ant. xviii. v. 3. he returned it is said to Rome, ἐνιαντῷ πρότερον ἢ τελευτῆσαι Τιβερίον.

If this, however, is to be understood of the first return since he last left it, posterior to the death of Drusus, Josephus is at variance with himself. For in this case, Agrippa returned some time soon after U. C. 789. *ineuntem*; for Tiberius died U. C. 790. *ineunte*.

Now on leaving Tiberias, he retired for a time to

^u Tacitus, Ann. iv. 57. 59. 67. Suetonius, Tiberius, 39, 40. Cf. Tacitus, Ann. iv. 62. ^v Ant. Jud. xviii. vi. 2.

the court of Flaccus, the president of Syria^w: nor was it until after residing there some time, and a misunderstanding which at last arose between himself and Flaccus, that he finally departed, by way of Egypt, (as Philo also attests,) to Rome^x. Consequently, Flaccus was alive when Agrippa left Syria. But Flaccus was not alive after the nineteenth of Tiberius; for he died in office at the beginning of his twentieth year, U. C. 786^y, as is proved by one of the coins of Antioch, which bears his name, compared with the above quoted passage from Tacitus^z: and he was succeeded early in the course of U. C. 787, by Vitellius^{a*}. Agrippa then could not have left Syria later than U. C. 786. *ineunte*, which would be *four* years, and not *one* year, before U. C. 790. *ineuntem*. Josephus himself shews^b that in the twentieth of Tiberius, which answers partly to U. C. 786. and partly to U. C. 787. Vitellius, and no longer Flaccus, was now in office in Syria.

Nor indeed is it probable that the particulars which begin to be related from the time of this return, to the date of the death of Tiberius^c, could all have been comprehended in a single year; especially as the imprisonment of Agrippa alone occupied six months of the interval^{d†}.

* It is true, Vitellius was consul U. C. 787. but the consulate, at this time, was held only for a few months. He might consequently still be dispatched into Syria by the middle of the same year: and this is implied by Suetonius, (loc. cit.) when he describes him as *Ex consulatu Syriæ præpositus*.

† Besides, when he first returned, Tiberius was at Caprææ. According to Suetonius^f, he did not stir from the Villa Jovis in that island, for nine months after the death of Sejanus, which was xv. kal. of November^g, October 18. U. C. 784. Tib. xviii. *ineunte*. and while he was still there, U. C.

^w Ant. Jud. xviii. vi. 2. ^x Ibid. 3. Philo Judæus, ii. 521. l. 25—28. *Adversus Flaccum*. ^y Tacitus, Ann. vi. 27. ^z Eckhel, iii. 279. ^a Suetonius, Vitellius, 2. Tacitus, Ann. vi. 32. Pliny, H. N. xv. 21. ^b Ant. Jud. xviii. iv. 5. 6. ^c xviii. vi. 4—10. ^d Ibid. 7. De Bello, ii. ix. 5. ^e Ant. xviii. vi. 4. ^f Tiberius, 65. ^g Tacitus, Ann. vi. 25. Cf. Dio, lviii. 12.

It is asserted by Josephus, that Herod the tetrarch fell in love with Herodias, as he was entertained in

784. or 785. he must have sent for Caius Cæsar first to join him; for this he did in Caius' twentieth year, that is, before August 31. U. C. 785^h. But Tacitus shewsⁱ, that soon after the beginning of U. C. 785. he was in the neighbourhood of the city; nor does he mention any actual return to Capreæ before the beginning of U. C. 786^k. Consequently the return, which was before alluded to^l, could be no return to Capreæ as such, or only a proleptical allusion to this return in U. C. 786. According to Dio also, at the beginning of U. C. 786. Tiberius was within thirty stades of Rome^m; at which time he disposed of his grand-daughters in marriage, as Tacitus likewise shewedⁿ. In U. C. 787. he was at Tusculum^o; in U. C. 788. at Antium^p; nor did he ever return to Capreæ; but when he was on his way thither, he was surprised by his last sickness at the Villa Luculli, or Misenum^q; where, U. C. 790, *ineunte*, he breathed his last.

Josephus also shews that he was in Campania six months before his death; and though he supposes him to have returned to Capreæ prior to that event, this is a mistake easily accounted

for. He was actually repairing to Capreæ, when he fell sick and died.

It would seem, then, that the only time when Agrippa could have found the emperor at Capreæ before the death of Flaccus, was either in his eighteenth year, between U. C. 784 and U. C. 785. *medium*, or just at the middle of his nineteenth, U. C. 786. *ineunte*. And this is confirmed by the mention of Tiberius' soon after coming to Tusculum^r; for that was the visit to Tusculum which Dio placed U. C. 787; and Agrippa had been some time arrived before it.

The mention of Piso as prefect of the city^s when Agrippa's servant Eutychus was brought to trial, if this was the same Piso who died in office, U. C. 785. *medio*; ^t would prove the return of Agrippa to have been earlier than U. C. 785. *medio*; were it not that a certain Piso is still spoken of as prefect^u in the last year of Tiberius. According to Dio, and by an obvious correction of the text, Ælius Lamia succeeded to Piso U. C. 785. and according to Tacitus^v, Lamia also must have died in office, U. C. 786^w. The next prefect, according to Seneca^x, was

^h Suetonius, Caius, 10. 8. ⁱ Annales, vi. 1. ^k Ibid. 15. 20. ^l Ibid. 1. m lviii. 20. 21. 24. ⁿ Annales, vi. 15. ^o Dio, lviii. 24. ^p Ibid. 25. Tacitus, Ann. vi. 39. Cf. 20. For three years, consequently, though not at Rome, still he was absent from Capreæ. Hence, Plutarch, viii. 377. De Exsilio: Τιβέριος δὲ Καίσαρ ἐν Καπρεῶς ἑπτὰ ἔτη διηγήθη μέχρι τῆς τελευτῆς—would admit of explanation. ^q Dio, lviii. 28. Tacitus, Ann. vi. 50. Suetonius, Tiberius, 72. 73. ^r Ant. xviii. vi. 6. ^s xviii. vi. 5. ^t Tacitus, Ann. vi. 10. 11. Dio, lviii. 19. 20. ^u Ant. xviii. vi. 10. ^v Annales, vi. 27. ^w Horace, i. xxvi. and iii. xvii. are both addressed to Ælius Lamia; and were written about U. C. 731. Cf. also Epp. i. xiv. 6. and Carminum i. xxxvi. 7; the last of which implies that Lamia was *then* a young man; so that he might be alive, but he would necessarily be very old, U. C. 785. ^x Epistolæ, 83. §. 13.

the house of her first husband—σπελλόμενος ἐπὶ Ῥώμης^b—when preparing to go to Rome. There is no mention of his ever going to Rome, after he became tetrarch, except on this occasion, and on the last, U. C. 792; when he was deposed by Caius. The building however of Tiberias had been projected by him in honour of Tiberius^c—whose intimate friend

Cossus; that is, Cossus Cornelius Lentulus, consul in U. C. 753; and therefore, probably an old man in U. C. 786: which makes it less surprising that Sanquinius Maximus is mentioned as in office U. C. 792, *inunte*^y.

Josephus then has unquestionably made a mistake either in his first or his second mention of Piso; and the last supposition is much the more probable of the two. For after the death of Piso, the succession of prefects is manifestly obscure and intricate; and each was a very short time in office. But before his death Piso had been in office twenty years; and was much more likely to be generally known. Besides, the first of these occasions was an important one in the history of Agrippa; but the last had nothing to do with it. The trial of Eutychus ultimately led to his master's imprisonment. I think then we may trust to the accuracy of the first allusion: which is in fact placed beyond a question by the circumstance

just before noticed: viz. that this Piso was prefect of the city some time before Tiberius came to Tusculum, that is, before U. C. 787. In this case Agrippa must have been in Rome before the middle of U. C. 785. that is, the end of Tiberius' eighteenth at least. The note of time, therefore, xviii. v. 3. is either an oversight of the writer's, or it refers to some other return of Agrippa's, not to his first. Eutychus had been long in confinement after he had been imprisoned by Piso, before he was admitted to an audience of Tiberius^z. In the mean while his master might have gone back to Judæa—to see his wife and children, whom he certainly left there at first^a—and have again returned to Rome, a year before the death of Tiberius. Agrippa, during his imprisonment, as well as before, was much indebted to the good offices of Antonia, the grandmother of Caius. Suetonius, Caius, 10, and 23: she was still living both U. C. 785, and U. C. 790, or 791.

^y Dio, lix. 13. Tacitus, Ann. vi. 4. speaks of Sanquinius Maximus as Vir Consularis, U. C. 785. Dio says he was Consul Suffect, after Caius, U. C. 792. The Fasti that year shew a Sabinus Maximus, and U. C. 782. a Sanquinius Maximus. Probably in the former instance the Fasti are to be corrected by the latter.

^z Philo, Operum ii. 536. 4. Adv. Flaccum: mentions an instance in which Tiberius suffered a case to go on for *two* years at least, without coming to an hearing. Λάμπων μὲν, ἀσεβέας τῆς εἰς Τιβέριον Καίσαρα δίκην σχῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ διετίαν τριβομένου τοῦ πράγματος ἀπειρηκώς. κ', τ. λ. ^a xviii. vi. 3. ^b xviii. v. 1. ^c Ant. Jud. xviii. ii. 3. De Bello, ii. ix. 1.

he was—and from the place of the fact in the War, we may reasonably conclude that he founded it upon, or soon after, that emperor's accession to the throne. Hence if it took up the same length of time as Cæsarea, in his father's instance, it would not be ready to dedicate under ten or eleven years afterwards. Its foundation is placed by Eusebius in *Chronico*, U. C. 780; but the date of its coins, as determined by cardinal Noris, or by Eckhel^b, requires it to be placed not earlier than U. C. 770, nor later than U. C. 775: and this very discrepancy confirms our conjecture. It might have been begun in U. C. 770: but it could not have been finished before U. C. 780. The journey to Rome might be preparatory to its dedication.

Let us suppose then that the journey in question was made about this time. We may take it for granted it would be made in the spring quarter of the year. If so, in the spring quarter of U. C. 780. Herod would be lodging in his brother's house: and it is plainly implied by Josephus, that he stayed long enough with him not merely to fall in love with his wife, but to take the necessary steps for their future union—to enter into the usual spousal contract—by which they were to divorce themselves from their existing consorts, and then to be married to each other. All this might be arranged in the spring of Tiberius' thirteenth year, U. C. 780.

Now this engagement was not so secret, but that it became known before it could be executed even to the parties most injured by it. The daughter of Aretas at least was aware of its existence, before she was actually divorced; and the object of her escape to her father seems to have been to anticipate this divorce by

^b Eckhel, iii. 427. Eusebius, *Chronicon Armeno-Latinum*, ad annum Abami 2043.

a voluntary flight. If so, there is no need to have recourse to supernatural modes of communication, to bring it to the knowledge of the Baptist. The existence of such a contract, however, though it was not yet completed, was equivalent in every sense to a marriage; and the language ascribed to John, in each of the Evangelists, Matt. xiv. 4. Mark vi. 18: It is not allowed thee ἔχειν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου—applies as properly to a marriage intended, as to a marriage completed, between them*. The most probable time when the remonstrance on the part of the Baptist would take place, is upon his first hearing of the contract: for to denounce the crime beforehand was, if possible, to prevent its commission. His message would probably be sent by a disciple; and the reception of his message, at the very juncture when the passion of Herod, the influence of Herodias, Herod's desire of present concealment, and his regard to the reputation and authority of John, now at their highest, were most likely to combine together; would be the necessary prelude to his imprisonment. Both love, and pride, and policy, would concur to suggest this measure. It would not have been prudent in Herod to leave John at large behind him; nor would he continue his journey until

* Nor is it any objection, that St. Mark just before says, ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν: for so also does Josephus express himself, concerning Herod and Mariamne; though he had only espoused her, and they were not married until six or seven years afterwards: and about the contract of Marcus, the son of Alexander the Alabarch of Alexandria, to Bernice the daughter of Herod Agrippa^c; though that match

was *never* consummated.

Gen. xix. 14: "And Lot went out, and spake unto his sons in law, which married his daughters:" and yet they were only espoused to these sons in law. The truth is, espousals among the Jews were equivalent to marriage, and the breach of the spousal contract in either of the parties amounted to the crime of adultery.

^c De Bello, i. xii. 3. xvii. 8. Ant. xix. v. i.

he had committed him to prison : and in selecting Machærus as the place of his confinement, he seems to have been desirous to remove him as far off as possible^d. If so, the imprisonment of the Baptist would take place some time in the spring.

Nevertheless, I think there is reason to believe that the remonstrances of John were attended by some good effect, and delayed for a time the consummation of this incestuous union. It is not credible that Herod would hear him gladly, and do many things by his advice^e, while he continued to disregard him in this respect. Still less credible is it that John would cease to denounce the commission of this crime ; which even Josephus acknowledges^f to be a flagrant violation of the law. But what is chiefly to be observed, Herodias herself could scarcely have continued to entertain so deadly a resentment against him, after her ambition had once been gratified by obtaining its wish. There is no mode of accounting for this long-cherished animosity, with which, as the Evangelist tells us, she *fastened upon him and clung to him*, as some ferocious beast to its prey^g, except by supposing that the life and authority of John stood still between herself and the crown of Galilee.

If this was the case; even when Herod was returned from Rome, (which there is no reason to suppose he would do in the summer of Tiberius' thirteenth ; nor consequently, before the spring quarter of his fourteenth,) it does not follow that he would complete his marriage with her immediately. Josephus himself implies that there was some delay, longer or shorter, be-

^d Cf. De Bello, vii. vi. 1—3. ^e Mark vi. 20. ^f Ant. xvii. xiii. 1. xviii. v. 4.
^g Mark vi. 19. ἐνείχεν αὐτῷ—that is, what would otherwise be expressed by ἐμ-
 φῶναί τινι. Ælian, De Natura Animalium, ὁ δὲ ὡς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐνέφυ, εἴχετο, lib.
 viii. 1 : and again, ἀλλόμενον δὲ παραχρῆμα ἐνέφυ, ibid. 13. Theocritus,

αὐτὸν αἶψα ἀνιάρει, τί μιν μέλαν ἐκ χροὸς αἶμα
 ἐμφὺς ὡς λιμῆτις ἅπαν ἐκ βδέλλα πέπωκας ; Idyll. ii. 55.

tween the return and the marriage; of which the daughter of Aretas took advantage to make her escape—and in the course of which, Machærus might previously pass into the hands of her father.

The time of the death of the Baptist, as it has been seen heretofore, is agreeable to these suppositions: for we have had reason to conclude that it fell out soon after the middle of U. C. 781, the beginning of Tiberius' fifteenth year^g. It will follow only, that the birthday, which Herod was celebrating at that time, happened in the autumnal quarter of the year, and after, or at least not before the Jewish feast of Tabernacles; which fell that year on September 22 or 23. And it was about this time of the year, that he had been originally confirmed in his tetrarchy by Augustus; and on the demise of Augustus, by his personal friend and patron, Tiberius. It was the practice of his father to keep the day of his inauguration as an annual festival; and a similar custom was very generally prevalent in the East^h. The day of a king's accession was both considered and celebrated as his birthday: and in the Mishna it is actually called soⁱ. The magnificence of Herod's entertainment, as described by St. Mark^k, naturally suggests the inference that he was commemorating something more than his birthday*.

The chronological arrangement of these events may therefore very probably be stated as follows:

In the spring quarter of the thirteenth of Tiberius, U. C. 780, Herod fell in love with Herodias, and imprisoned John; and afterwards proceeded to Rome.

* In the Paschal Chronicon, placed on the 29th of Lous, or i. 407. l. 18. the death of John is August.

^g Vide Dissertation xxiii. vol. ii. 341. ^h Gen. xl. 20. Dan. v. 1. Esther i. 3. 5. Herodotus, Calliope, 110. ⁱ iv. 364. 3. ^k vi. 21.

In the spring quarter of the fourteenth, U.C. 781, he returned from Rome; and about the feast of Tabernacles in that year he put John to death.

Soon after this, Machærus passed into the possession of Aretas; the daughter of Aretas made her escape thither; and Herod was married to Herodias: all before the beginning of U.C. 782. the middle of the fifteenth of Tiberias.

In the spring quarter of U.C. 782, Agrippa might arrive at Malatha, from Rome; and about the middle of the same year, Tiberii xv. *exeunte*, he might be made Ἀγορανόμος of Tiberias.

In the course of the next year I should place his rupture with Herod; the scene of which according to Josephus was Tyre¹. I can imagine no time, about this period, when Herod could be in Tyre, unless after the passover U.C. 783. Tib. xvi. *medio*; when the Gospel narrative shews that he was in Jerusalem. It is probable he went down to Tyre from thence. If so, Agrippa would take refuge with Flaccus, U.C. 783. *ineunte*. In the court of Flaccus he seems to have continued at least a year: that is to say, until U.C. 784, the middle of Tiberius' seventeenth. One thing is certain from his own letter to Caius, as reported by Philo^m, that *he* was not in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, when Pilate was dedicating the shields—an event which we have seen reason to place *after* the seventeenth of Tiberiusⁿ—but his brother Arit obulus might be; and as Aristobulus was left in the court of Flaccus, and as Flaccus died about the end of Tiberius' nineteenth, this is a possible case.

If he set sail to Rome in the summer of U.C. 784.

¹ Ant. xviii. vi. 2. ^m Operum ii. 589. l. 41. et sqq: De Virtutibus. ⁿ Dissertation xiii. vol. i. 449, 450.

he would find Tiberius at Capreæ, and Piso prefect of the city; as Josephus supposes him to have found.

There is consequently no necessity, as some commentators have imagined, to assume that Josephus has made a mistake with respect to the place either of the imprisonment, or of the death of John. I admit that his account of these events is sufficiently obscure; and in particular, that he has assigned no good reason for the death, nor even for the imprisonment in question: which I have little doubt was done on purpose. But I see no ground to suspect the accuracy of his statements or the integrity of his text in this one respect: and as to the tradition that the body of John was buried in Sebaste*, if it implies that he was confined or executed *there*—and indeed with regard to the fact itself—it is entitled to little consideration.

* Cf. Hieronymus, *Operum* iii. 1241. *ad medium*, In Osee, i: 1455. *ad principium*, In Abdiam, i: Theophylact, i. 73. D. In Matt. xiv. Theodorit, E. H. iii. vii. 130. A. speaks of the tomb of John in Sebaste as having been broken into and destroyed in the time of Julian. Philostorgius, according to Photius' epitome of his Ecclesiastical History, vii. 4. 503. simply recorded that the body of John Baptist was interred in Palestine, though we may presume he meant to imply it was buried in Samaria; because he too proceeds to relate how his bones and those of the prophet Elisha, who was buried there, were exhumed by the Gentiles in the reign of Julian, and being mingled with the bones of brute animals, were burnt, and their ashes scattered in the air.

The head of the Baptist (which

we must of course assume to have been disposed of apart from his body) some monks of Cilicia (though originally of Jerusalem) pretended to have discovered in the reign of Valens: and after having been deposited for a time at Pantichium, near Chalcedon, it was brought thence to Constantinople, in the reign of Theodosius, about A. D. 392: Sozomen, E. H. vii. xxi. 737. B—738. B: xxiv. 741. D. Prosper in Chronico dates this translation, Coss. Valentiniano iv. et Neoterio, A. D. 390. The degree of credit due to this pretended discovery may be estimated from the fact, that according to Marcellinus Comes, another head of the Baptist was found at Emesa, in the reign of the emperor Marcian, A. D. 453. Cf. Theophylact, *loco supra laudato*.

I have said nothing here of the difficulty which attaches to the name of Herodias' first husband ; for that is a difficulty which however great does not concern the present question. There can be no reasonable doubt that this husband, both in Josephus and in the Gospels, is the same person ; and whether he was called Herod, or Philip ; or whether he was called by both names ; is indifferent to the truth of the facts which we have been considering. For the discussion of these points, then, I refer my reader to Lardnerⁿ : observing only that, after all, the word Philip in the Gospel text is very probably an interpolation. Griesbach considers this unquestionable in the case of Luke iii. 19 ; and shews it to be not improbable of Matt. xiv. 3 : in which case no one perhaps will hesitate to pronounce the same judgment on Mark vi. 17.

I shall conclude, therefore, with one more remark. Herod the tetrarch first heard of the fame of Jesus after the death of John, and the mission of the Twelve ; towards the end of our Lord's second year. Now during all his first year he would be absent at Rome ; and consequently could not hear of him in that : and during the first half of his second before he put John to death, he might not yet be returned from Rome ; or he might be in Peræa, the most distant part of his dominions, where Machærus (in which John was imprisoned) was situated ; and into which our Saviour's ministry had not yet passed. It is not very probable indeed that Herod's birthday was celebrated in Machærus : but wherever John was until then, it is probable Herod also would be. Else how could he have *heard him*, and *observed him*, and *done many things at his bidding*^o ? To celebrate his birthday he might repair to Tiberias ; or to Sepphoris ; or

ⁿ Credibility, book ii. chap. v. ^o Mark vi. 20.

some other of his principal cities : leaving John in Machærus. I do not think, then, that he could have heard of our Saviour sooner than the Gospel narrative represents him to have heard : which we may justly consider a strong confirmation of the whole of our preceding reasonings.

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION XI.

On the date of the Exodus, and of the first passover.

Vide Dissertation xii. vol. i. page 412. line 16.

IF the reader is disposed to allow me the conclusion, the probability of which I endeavoured in the proper place to establish by a number of coincidences; viz. that the day of our Saviour's birth, U. C. 750. B. C. 4, was in all likelihood the tenth of the Jewish Nisan, the fifth of the Julian April, and the seventh day of the week; there are yet other coincidences, connected with this conclusion, which I think it not unimportant nor irrelevant to my general argument, to mention; and which, long as I dwelt on this subject, may perhaps be my apology, if I resume it here again.

It is the opinion of almost all writers upon ancient chronology, as well as of all commentators on scripture, that the world was created at one of the equinoctial points or seasons of the year: in other words, that at the beginning of the mundane system, which is also the beginning of historical time, the earth and the sun were situated relatively to each other, as they are situated twice every year—once in the spring, at the commencement of the vernal quarter; and again in the autumn, at the commencement of the autumnal. Arguing upon this supposition, and considering the time of our Saviour's birth as the era of a kind of new creation, analogous in a spiritual sense to the old or

original one in a physical ; many divines and learned men have considered it, *a priori*, a natural and probable presumption that the time of his nativity coincided either with the spring or the autumn ; nor in fact has there been in general any other opinion about it. The whole course of our reasonings was in favour of the vernal, and not of the autumnal quarter of the year ; for which conclusion there is this further argument also ; viz. that if the nativity of Christ, as the era of a new system of things analogous in any sense to the old, must coincide with the time of the year at which *that* began, it is much the most probable supposition in itself, and much the most consistent with the Mosaic narrative, that the era of the physical creation begins and proceeds from the spring ; than that it does so from the autumn.

At the time of the birth of Christ, in whatever year we may suppose it to have fallen out, the vernal equinox, as it is called, may be said in popular language to have coincided with March 24 : and March 24, as far as we have hitherto discovered, is distinguished by no preeminence in the course of our Saviour's history : but instead of March 24, a day twelve days later, April 5. If then April 5, B. C. 4, was the true date of the nativity, either the opinion that our Lord was born at the vernal equinox, must be given up ; and with it all regard to the analogy above mentioned ; or April 5, in some sense or other, must still have been the day of the vernal equinox ; or such a day as even then might justly be considered analogous to the day of the vernal equinox.

In consequence of the difference between the length of the *solar* or *tropical*, and that of the *civil* or *Julian* year, which difference amounts to eleven minutes and three seconds of time annually ; the vernal equinox is

liable to a constant precession ; which, in the course of one hundred and thirty years, amounts as nearly as possible to four and twenty hours ; or an entire day and night *. Hence if March 24. was the date of this equinox at the time of our Saviour's birth ; not March 24. but some day considerably earlier than March 24. must have been the date of this equinox, some hundreds of years before. April 5. then might have been that day once ; and it is easy to determine the exact time when.

By referring to the table of vernal equinoxes in Dr. Hales' *Analysis of Chronology* ^a, it will be seen that B. C. 4. stands almost exactly as the intermediate point of time, sixty-five years after the date of the vernal equinox had begun to be March 24. and sixty-five years before it began to be March 23. From this point of time let us reckon back twelve periods of one hundred and thirty years each ; answerable to the rate of precession through twelve entire days and nights : and the beginning of the first of those periods will coincide with the time when the vernal equinox fell between April 5. and April 4 ; sixty-five years after it had begun to fall on the former, and sixty-five years before it began

* This precession of the vernal equinox is not to be confounded with the precession of the equinoctial points of the earth's orbit. The former is owing to the difference in length between a year, which is supposed to consist of three hundred and sixty-five days and six hours exactly, and one, which consists of eleven minutes and three seconds less than that ; the latter to an actual retrograde movement of the plane of

the ecliptic, and therefore of its intersection with the plane of the equator ; by which the longitude of the fixed stars, and the place of the sun, in the signs of the zodiac, at the ingress into the vernal or any other quarter of the year, in one year compared with another, are both necessarily affected—but the length of the tropical year, and consequently the difference between that and the length of the civil, is not affected.

^a Vol. i. 157.

to fall on the latter. The year before Christ, to which this time corresponds, may be thus determined.

The rate of precession, which I assume to amount in every year to eleven minutes and three seconds, accumulates in one hundred and thirty years, not to twenty-four hours exactly, but to twenty-three hours, fifty-six minutes, and thirty seconds; which is three minutes and one half in defect. In the course of twelve times 130, or 1560 years, this defect will amount to forty-two minutes in all; and these forty-two minutes, at the rate of eleven minutes to every year, are as nearly as possible equivalent to four years of precession. It follows, then, that in twelve periods of one hundred and thirty years, the rate of precession will amount to twelve days and nights, minus forty-two minutes; or what is the same thing, to 1560 minus four years; that is, to 1556 years in all. Add these to B. C. 4: and the result, B. C. 1560, will as precisely express the exact point of time when the vernal equinox fell between April 5 and April 4, as B. C. 4 does that, when after twelve revolutions of one hundred and thirty years each, it fell between March 24 and March 23.

To what purpose however is this conclusion? If it can be proved that B. C. 1560, when this was the case, was the true year of the Exodus, and therefore of the first institution of the passover; I think every one will allow it to be something significant. Our Saviour might be born, in the fulness of time, on the day which the connection of the final end of his birth with the original appointment of the passover had fixed long before; and consequently not on March 24, the date of the vernal equinox B. C. 4, but on April 5, the date of the same time B. C. 1560; if that year was the year of the Exodus from Egypt.

That B. C. 1560. was the year of the Exodus may

be shewn, as it appears to me, both *a priori* and *a posteriori*, with a strength and cogency of proof which, under the circumstances of the case, are much more than we might have expected; and which, as we may almost undertake to pronounce, will apply to no year whatever except that—*a priori*, by demonstrating its agreement with the course and succession of events from the creation to the time of the departure from Egypt—and *a posteriori*, by shewing its agreement with the course and succession of events from that time to the birth of Christ.

When entering however upon the statement of this proof, it is not to be expected that we should descend into all the minutiae of detail, or all the prolixity of discussion, which a survey of the chronology of the world for a period of four thousand years or more would appear at first sight to require. To do this would take up a volume by itself. It will be sufficient for the present purpose if we ascertain only the principal dates; that is, if we fix the eras of *cardinal* successive events, by which, and within which, all minor and subordinate particulars, if it were necessary, might be calculated or distributed: and that as concisely as possible.

But before we begin, it is requisite to premise that the only foundation for our calculations, which I propose to acknowledge, is the Hebrew text; in comparison of which I cannot admit the superior claims either of the Septuagint or of Josephus. I am persuaded, that for the early history of the world, from the creation downwards, there is no sure nor authentic source of information but this; and that when we forsake it for any other guide, we are liable to involve ourselves in perplexity and error. I do not think any good argument can be alleged that the world is of greater antiquity, as

referred to the Christian era, than the Hebrew computation of time makes it to be ; yet between that and the computation, which has been admitted by many of the learned in preference to it, there is more than a thousand years' difference ; and on some principles more than fifteen hundred. On this question, however, our present limits necessarily preclude us from entering. Suffice it to say, that in the review of the Antediluvian or the Postdiluvian chronology, which I am about to exhibit ; I shall take the Hebrew verity as my guide, and, except where there is good and implicit reason so to do, I shall not venture to depart from it.

It is a singular circumstance that, for the first three centuries after the Christian era, almost *unanimously* ; and for many centuries at intervals, even lower down, with a great inclination in favour of the same opinion ; it was the tradition of the fathers of the church, that the six days employed on the creation were typical of as many thousand years of the world's future existence ; and that the seventh day or sabbath, which ensued at the end of the work of creation, was typical of a seventh and final millennium, to ensue at the end of all. Into the origin of this tradition we need not inquire ; but its existence almost coeval with Christianity itself, and for a long time afterwards, may be asserted as a fact, which no one who is conversant with the writings of the most ancient of the fathers will think of denying.

The prophecy which some of the same authorities ascribe at one time to Enoch, at another to Elias : Sex millia annorum mundi : duomillia Inane ; duo millia Lex ; duo millia Christus : Six thousand years of the world ; two thousand to the Void ; two thousand to the Law ; two thousand to the Christ : is a clear proof how they

considered these millennia to be divided. Now it is a singular coincidence that, according to the Bible chronology, which certainly was not constructed expressly to produce it; the birth of Christ, if placed B. C. 4, is stated exactly at the close of the fourth millennium: for if A. M. 1, the year of the creation, answers to B. C. 4004. A. M. 4001, at the close of the fourth millennium, answers to B. C. 4, the assumed date of the birth of Christ. The coincidence would be still more critical if Christ was born, as the world was created, in the spring; for then it would be difficult to say whether he was born at the end of the *fourth*, or at the beginning of the *fifth* millennium, each of which coincides alike with B. C. 4; were it not that we have rendered it probable that he was born between the two.

This division of the millennia of the world is closely connected with the doctrine of the Σαββατισμὸς^b, or millenary reign of Christ on earth; upon which, however, I cannot pause now to enter, further than to say, that in my opinion it is too clearly recognised in scripture, and in a variety of ways direct and indirect, to be lightly disbelieved or called in question. I will observe only, that the division itself is strongly implied in the use of those expressions, τέλη τῶν αἰώνων — συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος — αἰὼν, or αἰῶνες, joined with a verb, participle, or pronoun describing either the past, the present, or the future. It is, in general, an inaccurate version to render these expressions by the *ends*, or *end*, of the *world*, or *worlds*; for as ævum, or ævom, (sæculum,) in Latin would be denoted by αἰὼν in Greek; (whence, though the term is obsolete in that language, it must have been originally derived;) and both would imply a period of not less than one

^b Hebrews iv. 9.

hundred years; so is αἰὼν, in the latter particularly, a *collection* of such periods—a certain number of *great* periods making up a still *greater* conjointly. In most instances, then, and especially when coupled with the substantives τέλη or συντέλεια, with the participles of time, or with other words expressive of the past, the present, or the future; it should be rendered accordingly by *periods of ages*, or the like; and it will always denote the appointed term or duration of time, measured by centuries, for which one œconomy should last, or had lasted, before it should be succeeded, or had been succeeded by another. On this principle, it has always appeared to me that, under the name of the αἰῶνες past, the inspired writers of the New Testament frequently meant to describe the period from the creation to the beginning of the Christian dispensation; and under the name of the αἰὼν present or to come, that they intended the duration of that dispensation itself: and at the close of that, by whatever else it may be succeeded, first and properly the duration of the sabbatic millenium, or the millenary reign of Christ on earth. Vide Matt. xiii. 39. 40. 49. xxiv. 3. xxviii. 20. Mark x. 30. Luke xviii. 30. xx. 35.

Now if Christ, from the call of Abraham to the conclusion of the prior dispensation by his advent in the flesh, was in all things the final end contemplated by it; and if the Christian was throughout the antitype of the Mosaic œconomy; it is reasonable to conclude that, as they agree and correspond together in so many other respects, so they should be found to agree and correspond in their beginnings and their duration also: and if the first call of Abraham took place A. M. 2001, as the birth of Christ took place A. M. 4001, this will actually be the case between them.

I date the call of Abraham not from his call into Canaan, which was a *second* call, but from his call into Haran or Charran, which was the *first*; the former after the death of Terah, the latter before it ^c. Between these two calls there was a certain interval of time which scripture has left indefinite; and in this indefiniteness consists the whole of the difficulty with which, in the present part of our subject, we have to contend. For, from the time of the departure out of Charran, to the time of the Exodus, every thing is clear; as the following statements will prove.

I. From this departure to the birth of Isaac there were ^d twenty-five years.

II. From the birth of Isaac to the birth of Jacob there were ^e sixty years.

III. From the birth of Jacob to the descent into Egypt there were ^f one hundred and thirty years.

IV. From the descent into Egypt to the Exodus there were ^g two hundred and fifteen years.

It thus appears that, from the time of the call of Abraham into Canaan to the time of the Exodus, there were just four hundred and thirty years; which period of time was so critically divided between these two extreme points, that the first two hundred and fifteen years of it were spent in Canaan, and the next in Egypt. Nor would it be difficult, by the help of the data referred to in the margin ^h, to shew how this residence in Egypt might have been filled up, between the descent, and the birth of Moses; and between that, and the Exodus. But for the sake of brevity we need not now do this. We may proceed merely to observe, that if

^c Acts vii. 2, 3, 4. Josh. xxiv. 2, 3. Gen. xi. 31, 32. xii. 1. ^d Gen. xii. 4. xxi. 5. ^e xxv. 26. ^f xlvii. 9. ^g Exod. xii. 40. Gen. xv. 13. Acts vii. 6. Gal. iii. 17. ^h Gen. xli. 46—54. xlv. 6. xlvii. 11. l. 22. 26. Exod. vi. 16. 18. 20. vii. 7. Acts vii. 23.

the Exodus, as we assumed, took place B. C. 1560. A. M. 2445, the call of Abraham into Canaan, just four hundred and thirty years before, took place B. C. 1990. A. M. 2015. Let us suppose that before this he had been fourteen years resident in Charran *. His original call out of Chaldæa must have taken place B. C. 2004. A. M. 2001: a very exact coincidence.

The interval, between the creation and the first call of Abraham to Charran, comes now to be considered. If we are right in our principles, it must have been one of two thousand years.

From the birth of Seth, when Adam was one hundred and thirty years old^j, to the age of Noah at the birth of Shem, (which it is asserted was five hundred years,) and from thence to the flood, the specified intervals amount to 1656 years^k: and from the time of the flood to the birth of Terah the father of Abraham, the specified intervals amount to 222^l. If the flood then befell A. M. 1657. the birth of Terah happened A. M. 1879.

* The interval in question is recognised virtually by Origen, in the following passage, *Opera* ii. 31. A. *Selecta* In Genesim: ὅσπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ οὐκ ἐλογίσθη εἰς ζῶν τὰ ἐξήκοντα ἔτη τὰ πρὸ τῆς θεογονώσεως αὐτοῦ, κ', τ. λ. If Abraham was sixty when God first revealed himself to him, and seventy-five when he was commanded to leave Haran, after his father's death, and to go into Canaan; his call from Ur of Chaldæa into Haran was fifteen years prior to his final

departure thence into Canaan. And so in fact it is stated in the *Chronicon* of Julius Pollux, p. 84, a work which we have had occasion to quote heretoforeⁱ. A similar statement occurs in Syncellus also, i. 185. 9—17. It seems to have been contained likewise in the apocryphal Book of Tharah: see the *Codex Pseudepigraphus*, i. 336—341. cv. Cf. also, the extract from Gregorius Abulpharajius, *Ibid.* 422.

ⁱ This *Chronicon*, in its present state, terminates with the reign of Valens, A. D. 378. But there is internal evidence at page 324. that the author of it lived later than the date of the council of Chalcedon at least, in the first of Marcian, A. D. 451. ^j Gen. v. 3. ^k Gen. v. 32. xi. 10. ix. 28, 29. ^l xi. 10—24.

At seventy years old it is said that he had begotten Abram, Nahor, and Haran^m; where, though Haran is mentioned last, I think it is morally certain that he was the eldest son of Terah; first because he died before his father; secondly because he was married before his death, and the father of three children, Lot, Milcah, and Iscah or Sarah; the last of whom was but ten years younger than Abraham himselfⁿ. In like manner I think it most probable that Abram was his second son, and Nahor his youngest; for Sarah the wife of Abraham was probably older than Milcah the wife of Nahor.

And hence we may best understand the assertion, that Terah begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran, when he had lived seventy years. They were all begotten *before* he was seventy; and perhaps the youngest of them, Nahor, *when* he was seventy; but none of them *after*. The age of the *padogonia*, just before the birth of Terah, was as early as twenty-nine; and in no case since the flood had it exceeded thirty-five: so that it cannot be credible that Terah should have lived twice this last term of years before he had begotten his eldest son. This eldest son himself died at an age when he was old enough to have a daughter, who was sixty-four years old at the death of Terah, when Abraham was seventy-four. The note of time, then, used absolutely to mark the age of Terah at the birth of his *three* sons, which cannot without a palpable absurdity be understood of his age at the birth of them all, nor without almost the same of his age at the birth of his eldest; must be understood of his age at the birth of his youngest; in which sense only the assertion would strictly be true.

And hence, also, we may justly infer that the statement of the whole age of Terah^o, as it stands in the

^m Gen. xi. 26.

ⁿ xi. 27, 28, 29. xvii. 17.

^o xi. 32.

Hebrew text at present, cannot possibly be correct; and requires to be amended. For though Abram himself had been Terah's youngest son, and born when Terah was seventy, the age of Terah at his death could not be computed as greater than *seventy* in addition to the *age* of Abraham at the time when Terah died. Now Terah was dead when Abraham was called into Canaan; and Abraham was seventy-five years old when he was called into Canaan^p: the age of Terah then before this migration and at his death, could not possibly have been more than one hundred and forty-five; at which also it is represented in the Samaritan Pentateuch.

But the true length of the life of Terah, as it appears to me, was neither two hundred and five, nor one hundred and forty-five; but one hundred and thirty-five. It is not said of him how long he lived after he begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran; his age must have been stated absolutely; viz. that he lived so many years and died: and hence the origin of the mistake. Moses might simply have written, The days of Terah were one hundred and thirty-five years; which some scribe considering to be distinct from the time before specified, that he lived seventy years and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran; added the one to the other, as making up the sum total of his life. And this conjecture is greatly confirmed by the result. For $70 + 135 = 205$. The Samaritan Pentateuch, in like manner, taking Abraham to have been born when Terah was seventy, added this to the number specified, Gen. xii. 4, of seventy-five; and so made the age of Terah to be one hundred and forty-five. It is not likely that Terah would enjoy a longer life than Abraham himself, who died at one hundred and seventy-five; or

^p Gen. xi. 28. 31. Acts vii. 4. Gen. xii. 4.

than Isaac or Jacob, who died the former at one hundred and eighty, and the latter at one hundred and forty-seven ^q *.

I conclude, then, that the age of Terah at his death was one hundred and thirty-five; whence, if he was born A. M. 1879, he died A. M. 2014. On this principle, Abraham, who was called into Canaan A. M. 2015, was called thither in the year after his father's death; as St. Stephen's words alone ^r would almost suffice to imply. It is no unreasonable supposition that before this Terah might have been fourteen years resident in Charran; and consequently that the original call from Mesopotamia thither, in which *he* was concerned as well as Abraham, took place A. M. 2001. Still less unreasonable is it to suppose that this migration took place very soon after the death of Haran. The very name given to Haran, where they settled at first, would seem to imply that ^s; and if Haran had been born when Terah was thirty or thirty-five, and had lived to be only seventy years old or not much more, he would not die before Terah was one hundred or one hundred and five at least; and if *he* also had been married at thirty, he might leave behind him children, the oldest of whom might then be forty; and Sarah in particular (who was sixty-four when Terah was one hundred and thirty-five years old, and therefore was born when Terah was seventy-one) would be about thirty years old; and consequently of a marriageable age. On this point however there is no need to descend into minutiae.

The agreement of the assumed date of the Exodus,

* In the Septuagint, Gen. xi. 32. it stands: "And all the days of Terah in the land of Haran

were 205 years:" which is a manifest interpolation.

^q Gen. xxv. 7. xxxv. 28. xlvii. 28.

^r Acts vii. 4.

^s Gen. xi. 31.

B. C. 1560, with the history of things previous to that event having been thus established; its accordance with the detail of particulars subsequent to it is next to be shewn. And this I shall endeavour to effect as low down as the time of the building of the temple; after which it will not be necessary for us to proceed any further at present; insomuch as the date, which we shall be found to assign to the time of this building, will very nearly coincide with the date assigned to it also by the Bible chronology.

I. If the Exodus from Egypt took place exactly B. C. 1560. A. M. 2445, the Eisodus into the land of Canaan, forty years complete afterwards, took place B. C. 1520, A. M. 2425; at the same time of the year in either case ^t.

II. After the Eisodus, B. C. 1520, and five or six years of incessant warfare; the seventh, B. C. 1514, was the time when the settlement of the country was completed by the division of the conquered lands: as it may thus be proved.

Caleb was forty years old in the second year after the Exodus, B. C. 1559, at the time of the mission of the spies; and eighty-five years old at the time of the division of the lands, when Joshua assigned him Kirjath-arba. His language implies that at each of these times he was of such and such an age complete ^u; and the former of the two was the close of the summer of the year ^v; therefore so was the latter. Hence if Caleb was forty complete at the close of the summer, B. C. 1559, he was eighty-five complete at the same time of the year, B. C. 1514. It follows, then, that with the summer ^{*} of B. C. 1514. in the seventh year after the

^{*} Josephus, also, Ant. Jud. v. of the lands in the *seventh* i. 21, 22: places the division month.

^t Numb. xiv. 33, 34. Deut. i. 3. ii. 14. xiii. 20—25.

^u Josh. xiv. 7. 10.

^v Numb.

Eisodus, the division of the lands was either just complete or nearly so ^w. Whence from this time forward, but not before it, the land would have rest from war ^x; and the peaceful occupation of the country would begin.

The first cycle of sabbatic years, therefore, which began and expired with the autumn, would begin with the autumn of B. C. 1513; and the first sabbatic year itself would begin with the autumn B. C. 1507, and expire with the autumn B. C. 1506: the truth of which inference may further be confirmed as follows.

It has been proved heretofore^y, by data entirely independent of this assumption, that A. D. 27–28, in the first and second years of our Saviour's ministry, was a sabbatic year. To B. C. 1507–1506. add A. D. 27–28: the result is in each case 1534; a number, divisible by seven, with a remainder of one. If the first of the number then was a sabbatic year, so was the last—and if the last, so was the first. Nor is it without an observable propriety that, as the cycle of sabbatic years began and could begin only with the time when the land rested from war, or the people were first securely settled in their inheritances; so the time of this rest coincided with the seventh year after the Eisodus, and six years of incessant war. This seventh year itself would so far be tantamount to a sabbatic year; and it would make no difference whether we dated the first such year from B. C. 1514—B. C. 1513, or from B. C. 1507—B. C. 1506. Add 27–28. to the former, and the result, 1541, is divisible by seven with a remainder of one, as much as before.

In like manner the cycle of Jubiles, which were required to be celebrated every fiftieth year, and the

^w Vide also Josh. xi. 23. xiv. 1. xxi. 43–45. ^x xiv. 15. xi. 23. ^y Dissertation xxii. vol. ii. 232–244.

recurrence and celebration of which were entirely independent of those of sabbatic years^y; would begin and proceed with the year of the Eisodus itself: and this conclusion also may be confirmed by the following argument.

It has often been considered probable that the institution of the year of Jubile had a secret reference to the spiritual benefits, which should arise from the death and passion of our Saviour Christ. If so, the true year of Jubile; the year of the spiritual release analogous preeminently to the legal; was that year, above all others, which ensued on the death and resurrection of our Lord. And though the observance of the years of Jubile, as part of the ritual of the Law, might have fallen into disuse at the time of the Christian era, this should make no difference. The first year of the publication of the Gospel as such, it might be expected, would still correspond with a legal year of Jubile. If that year was A. D. 30, and the cycle of Jubiles began B. C. 1520, this follows as matter of course: $1520 + 30 = 1550$; a number in which there would be thirty-one Jubiles exactly: the first, in the fiftieth year from the Eisodus, B. C. 1471; the last, A. D. 30.

III. There is no reason to suppose that Joshua was not a much older person than Caleb; and he is spoken of as a very old man directly after the settlement of the country^z. Hence, if Caleb was eighty-five, B. C. 1514, Joshua might be more. Now he died at the age of one hundred and ten^a. Let us suppose that he survived the division of the lands ten years; and consequently that he was one hundred years old, B. C. 1514. He was ninety-four years old, B. C. 1520, when Caleb was seventy-nine: and he would die, B. C. 1504.

^y Lev. xxv. 1—22.

^z Josh. xiii. 1.

^a Josh. xxiv. 29.

A. M. 2501: just 1500 years before the true date of the birth of Christ.

IV. There is a note of time incidently specified in Judges ^b, which proves that, from the settlement of the people in their possessions, to the end of the subjection to the Ammonites, from which the Israelites were delivered by Jephthah; there was an interval of three hundred years either more or less. The actual periods, beginning at Judges iii. 8, and ending with this deliverance, x. 8, amount in all to 319 years; which approaches so near to a current statement, like this of Jephthah's, that we may consider it to be the truth. If so, from the death of Joshua, B. C. 1504, to the time of the deliverance from the Ammonites, there were about 319 years; that is, the time of this deliverance was about B. C. 1185, or 1186.

V. From the time of the deliverance from the subjection to the Ammonites, to the end of the forty years' subjection to the Philistines, the specified intervals amount to 71 years in all^c: which added to the former 319 make up 390. Now within this forty years' subjection to the Philistines is manifestly included the twenty years' partial deliverance by Samson ^d; and as it appears to me the forty years' judging of Eli ^e. For it is evident that, at the time of the death of Eli, the oppression of the people by the Philistines was still continuing; which oppression there is no reason to suppose was part of any new term of years; and consequently must have been part of the old ^f. If so, the administration of Eli and the subjection of the people to the Philistines; being each of them forty years in extent, and each of them terminated together, or within a very short time of each other; must have begun

^b Judges xi. 26.

^c Judges xii. 7—xiii. 1.

^d xv. 20. xvi. 31.

^e 1 Sam. iv. 18.

^f 1 Sam. iv. 7. 9.

together ; including in the latter part of both the twenty years of partial deliverance by Samson. On this principle, the close of the administration of Eli, about 390 years after B. C. 1504, fell about B. C. 1114. or 1115.

VI. After this, we must take into account the length of the administration of Samuel, who succeeded to Eli ; (and, as it would seem, in one year's time, subsequent to his death and the capture of the ark ^g;) until the appointment of the first king in the person of Saul : and after this appointment, the length of the reign of Saul, until the accession of David : and we shall obtain the time of the accession of David. We may collect from Acts xiii. 21, that the length of the reign of Saul must be stated, in some sense or other, at a period of forty years : and from 1 Sam. vii. 2, that the length of the administration of Samuel was not less than twenty years. We may allow then for both these periods together sixty years in all ; twenty to the latter and forty to the former ; and the interval between the time of the death of Joshua and the time of the accession of David becomes 390 + 60, or 450, years : so that, if the former was B. C. 1504, the latter was B. C. 1054.

The accuracy of this calculation seems to be confirmed by the testimony of St. Paul ; who tells the Jews in the synagogue of Pisidian Antioch ^h, that the period for which they had been governed by judges, dated from some ἀρχὴ or other ; as low down as the prophet Samuel ; (and therefore ending with the close of his administration, which was that of the last of the judges;) was ὡς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πεντήκοντα ; a general statement, which was evidently not meant to be understood of 450 years exactly, but of some minor or major number roundly expressed, not very far short of that. There are two ἀρχαὶ or dates,

^g 1 Sam. vi. 1. 13. vii. 1. 3.

^h Acts xiii. 20.

to which as the context shews this calculation admits of being referred; one at verse 18, in the beginning of the forty years' probation in the wilderness—the other at verse 19, in the entrance into Canaan, and the reduction of the nations therein. In other words, the interval of 450 years, for which the people, if subject to any government, were subject to the government of judges and not of kings, is referred either to the date of the Exodus or to that of the Eisodus, as its beginning—and to the time of the appointment of Saul as its close.

I have little doubt that the first of these is that date which St. Paul had in view. He was marking out the course and succession of the changes in the government of the Jews from the earliest period to the time of Christ, with the eras or times of each; first from the Exodus to the last of the judges—secondly from the last of the judges to the first of the kings—thirdly from the first of the kings, until the time when, in the person of the second of the number, the inheritance of the kingdom, and with it the regal form of government, became for ever assured to one certain channel, by the transmission of the sceptre to David, as the father and type of Christ. Now between the date of the Exodus, B. C. 1560, and the time of the appointment of Saul, B. C. 1094, there are 466 years; and between the date of the Eisodus, B. C. 1520, and the same time there are 426; either of which might be called in round numbers *about* 450: for which too there might be this additional reason, viz. that the appointment of Othniel, the first judge as such, was about as much later, as we shall see hereafter, than the beginning of the smaller of these numbers; as that was than the beginning of the larger. There is another sense, it is true, in which the same calculation admits of being under-

stood, and which would bring it nearer still to the actual period of 450 years: but I consider it unnecessary to enter here upon the statement of it*: and equally so to shew how the length of the duration of the administration of Eli, before his death, admits of being harmonized with the early history of Samuel, before his appointment to the office of prophet, and afterwards of judge. It is sufficient that this, if requisite, might easily be effected†.

VII. From the appointment of Saul, B. C. 1094, to the accession of David, there was forty years' interval;

* The supposition, to which I allude, is briefly as follows. From the date of the Eisodus, B. C. 1520, to the beginning of Saul's sole reign, B. C. 1076, there were 444 years. From the same time, to the death of Samuel, about B. C. 1056, were 464. The mean point between these two periods would be as nearly as possible, 450.

† We may observe, however, that the substance of the book of Judges, from chapter xvii. to the end—which relates to the destructive war waged upon the tribe of Benjamin, at a time when Phinehas was the high-priestⁱ, and consequently early in the intermediate history—comes most probably within the eighty years which ensued on the deliverance from the subjection to the Moabites^k. Ehud, by whom that deliverance was effected, was himself a Benjamite; which renders it very improbable that his tribe had yet been nearly exterminated. But it is not said expressly that he judged, though it is said that he deliver-

ed, the people—nor yet how long he survived the deliverance. From the Eisodus, B. C. 1520, to the time of this deliverance, the specified interval, as we have calculated it generally, amounts to eighty-two years; which would place the beginning of the deliverance about B. C. 1440. At the time of the Eisodus, it is probable, Phinehas was a young man, not much above twenty years old^l; especially if, at the time of the mission of the spies, B. C. 1559, Eleazar his father must himself have been under the same age at least^m. Before Christ 1520, then, Phinehas might not be much more than twenty; and B. C. 1440, not much more than one hundred: whence if, like Joshua, he lived to be one hundred and ten, and much more if, like many others before him, he lived to be one hundred and twenty or thirty, he might be ministering in the priest's office long after the time of Ehud.

ⁱ xx. 28.

^k iii. 30.

^l Numbers xxvi. 2. xxxi. 6.

^m xiv. 29.

xxvi. 65. xxxii. 11. Deut. i. 35, 36, 38, 39. ii. 14.

and from the accession of David, to the beginning of the reign of Solomon, there was the same. The accession of David then was B. C. 1054, and the accession of Solomon B. C. 1014. The true length of the reign of Saul, indeed, as I shewed in the Twelfth Dissertationⁿ, vol. i. was thirty-nine years and about six months; and that of the reign of David forty years and six months; making up eighty years in all, beginning B. C. 1094, and ending B. C. 1014, as before. On this principle, also, the reign of David terminated, and the reign of Solomon began in the spring.

VIII. In the fourth year of his reign, and in the second month, (Zif, or Jar,) consequently B. C. 1011, he began to build the temple^o; and in seven years after, consequently about the same time, B. C. 1004, it was so far complete as to be said to be built; though its integrity in all its parts might not take place until the seventh month afterwards^p. This was, as it appears to me, when the whole edifice, being then complete, was dedicated. Still the temple was begun to be built B. C. 1011, and finished, in some sense or other, B. C. 1004, in the spring of the year in each case: which is so far an observable coincidence, that it comes in precisely one thousand years after the call of Abraham, B. C. 2004; and one thousand years before the birth of Christ, B. C. 4; three thousand years from the creation, A. M. 1; and three thousand years before the sabbatic millennium, (if any such event is then to take place,) A. M. 6001.

The temple, especially that part of it called κατ' ἑξοχὴν the ναὸς or sanctuary, and constructed after the pattern of the original Tabernacle, was a lively emblem of the body of Christ: and as *that* was built at a certain distance of time from the call of Abraham, so

ⁿ Page 396.

^o 1 Kings vi. 1.

^p vi. 37, 38. 2 Chron. iii. 2. v. 1. 3.

was *this* born into the world at the same distance of time from the building of *that*: and as after the building of the temple, at a certain distance of time from the beginning of all things, the presence of God upon earth became stationary in one place and within one sanctuary—called his house—so during the sabbatic millennium, if the return of Christ personally then takes place, at the same distance of time from the building of the temple, will it be again resident and stationary among men, for a thousand years more, to the consummation of all things. The parallel will hold still closer, if the temple, whose building, dimensions, and purposes are so minutely described by Ezekiel ^q, is no figurative or mystical structure; but something which will actually take place.

It is true, the continuity of the temple's existence, before the birth of Christ, was interrupted for the period of time during which it lay desolate, after its destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, and before its restoration by Zorobabel. But this defect in continuity, on the one side, is compensated by a corresponding excess, on the other. From the eleventh of Zedekiah, when the temple was burnt down, to the sixth of Darius, when it was again rebuilt, there was an interval of seventy-three years complete or current, before the birth of Christ, during which there was no temple: and from B. C. 4. to A. D. 70, when it was again destroyed, there was an interval of the same length of time, even after the nativity, during which there was still a temple. These are coincidences which cannot be ascribed to chance; and what renders them so much the more remarkable is this; viz. that the first temple, as we have seen, was finished in the spring, B. C. 1004; and so was the second on the third of Adar^r, B. C. 516.

^q Ezek. xl—xlviii.

^r Ezra vi. 15.

The first temple was destroyed on the eighth or the tenth of the fifth month, B. C. 588, and so was the second, A. D. 70. Moralizing on these things, Josephus, in the true spirit of a Pharisee, called them *fate*: a Christian should rather call them *contrivance*, and the ordering of times and seasons by the providential control of God.

The building of Solomon's temple is placed by the Bible Chronology also, B. C. 1012, only one year earlier than the date which we have assigned it; so that from this time forward it is unnecessary for us to continue the present inquiry. It is enough to refer, for the rest of the period between this building and the birth of Christ, to the authorities which have fixed the Bible Chronology. For the extreme points within which most of the succeeding events must be comprehended; the beginning of Solomon's reign on the one hand, and the commencement of the seventy years' captivity on the other; (where we first get upon the boundaries of sacred and profane chronology, in such a manner as to secure us from any subsequent material error;) I think this Chronology is safely to be trusted: and we may render this probable by pointing out its accuracy in one intermediate circumstance; the date assigned to the time of the deliverance of Jerusalem from the invasion of Sennacherib, in the reign of Hezekiah, B. C. 710.

The year of this deliverance was the year before a sabbatic year; and the year after it was a sabbatic year. The words of Isaiah^s: Ye shall eat this year such things as grow of themselves; and in the second year that which springeth of the same; and in the third year, sow ye, and reap, and plant vineyards and eat the fruits thereof: admit of no other construc-

^s 2 Kings xix. 29. Is. xxxvii. 30.

tion. On this principle, if the deliverance took place B. C. 710, the year after, B. C. 709—B. C. 708, was the sabbatic year in question. Add to these numbers, as in the former instance, A. D. 27–28: the result in either case, viz. 736, is a number divisible by seven, with a remainder of one. Hence if A. D. 27–28, was a sabbatic year, so was B. C. 709–708. The same conclusion follows from subtracting B. C. 709–708, the date of this sabbatic year, from B. C. 1507–1506, the date of the first as such. The difference 798 is exactly a multiple of seven: whence, if the first of the number was a sabbatic year, viz. B. C. 1507–1506, the last, which answers to B. C. 710–709, must have been the sixth year of the cycle; and the next a sabbatic year.

Now B. C. 710, the year of the deliverance was the fourteenth of Hezekiah*; which is to be collected not merely from 2 Kings xviii. 13. and Isaiah xxxvi. 1. but also from the fact that he reigned twenty-nine years in all^t; and survived the deliverance fifteen years^u. For from the context of all these accounts, it seems to me indisputably clear that the sickness, from which also he was miraculously delivered, attacked him directly after the discomfiture of Sennacherib. From the beginning of the reign of Solomon to the fourteenth of Hezekiah, inclusive of each, the specified lengths of the reigns of the kings of Judah, amount to three hundred and eight years; and from the fifteenth of Hezekiah, *inclusive*, to the fifth of Jehoiakim, *exclusive*, they amount to one hundred and seven. From B. C. 1014, the first of Solomon, to B. C. 710, the fourteenth of Hezekiah, *inclusive*, for the first of these in-

* So it is reckoned by Josephus, also, Ant. Jud. x. i. 1.

^t 2 Kings xviii. 2. 2 Chron. xxix. 1. ^u Is. xxxviii. 1. 5. 2 Kings xx. 1. 6. 2 Chron. xxxii. 24.

tervals we have three hundred and five years; and from B. C. 709, the fifteenth of Hezekiah, *inclusive*, to B. C. 606, the beginning of the seventy years' captivity, (which the Bible Chronology makes the fifth of Jehoiakim,) *exclusive*, we have for the second, one hundred and three. Consequently there is a difference in the one case of three years; and in the other of four; the former to be allowed for in thirteen reigns; and the latter in four or five. Now there is not a reign from Solomon's to Josiah's, (though there were seventeen reigns in all;) except perhaps Asa's^u; the length of which is specified in fractions of years, as well as in years complete. But it would be absurd to suppose that seventeen kings all reigned in succession an even number of months complete. The necessity therefore of making some allowance for current years, considered as complete, must be self-evident; and in the course of three hundred and five years, or even of one hundred and three, this consideration alone would abundantly compensate for so trifling a difference as three or four years either in excess or in defect.

I shall conclude this review, then, with the notice of one only remaining difficulty. The First of Kings, vi. 1, places the beginning to build the temple in the four hundred and eightieth year, after the coming of the children of Israel out of Egypt: but between B. C. 1560, our assumed date of the Exodus, and B. C. 1011, that of the beginning to build the temple, the interval is five hundred and forty-nine years; not four hundred and eighty. Now the Exodus was forty years prior to the entrance into Canaan; and either from this entrance, or at the utmost from the Exodus, even to the beginning of the reign of Saul, eighty-four years

^u 2 Chron. xvi. 13.

before the temple was begun, we had St. Paul's assurance that about four hundred and fifty years must have elapsed. It is manifest, therefore, that if the text is not corrupt, the date in question can be referred neither to the time of the Exodus, nor to the time of the Eisodus; but must be understood of some beginning even later than both: the nature of which may probably be thus determined.

Four hundred and eighty years reckoned backward from B. C. 1011, would begin B. C. 1491, which would be just thirteen years from the time of the death of Joshua, B. C. 1504. If this time was that of the appointment of Othniel, the first of the judges as such, it might possibly be made the date for the computation in the text: and that it might be the time of this appointment may be proved as follows.

If this year was the date of the appointment of Othniel, it was also the date of the expiration of the eight years' servitude to Chushan-rishathaim^v; and if so, that servitude expired B. C. 1491, and began B. C. 1499, five years after the death of Joshua. Now the servitude itself did not begin until after both the death of Joshua, and the death of the elders who outlived Joshua; by whom, I think, we must understand the surviving members of the Sanhedrim, originally instituted by Moses in the wilderness^w; and as we may suppose, kept up still to the period of his death: who, at the time of the Eisodus, were probably among the oldest persons, next to Caleb and Joshua, then alive; and whose death might consequently ensue within five or six years of that of Joshua, when probably none of them would be less than eighty years of age. From the beginning of the servitude to the time of Jephthah

^v Judges iii. 8. ^w Numb. xi. 16—30. xvi. 25. Deut. i. 9—18.

there were three hundred and nineteen years; which he, though dating from the settlement of the country called three hundred; whence we may infer, that these three hundred years began very near to the date of that settlement; and that very possibly from the commencement of the first servitude to the time of Jephthah, the exact interval was about three hundred and fourteen years, not three hundred and nineteen: the difference of five years between them being the interval between the death of Joshua, and that of the last of the elders who outlived Joshua—which difference, in the course of the subsequent computation, may easily be accounted for as follows.

Nothing is more probable than that, in almost every instance, the last year of a particular servitude is reckoned over again as the first of the deliverance, which ensued upon it: and it is a singular confirmation of this conjecture that, as we have *five* years of excess in the specified period of three hundred and nineteen years, considered as equivalent to three hundred and fourteen, and *five* years' interval between the death of Joshua and that of the last of the elders, before the beginning of the first servitude; so between the death of Joshua and the time of Jephthah, there were exactly *five* distinct and successive servitudes—to Chushan-rishathaim—to Eglon—to Jabin—to the Midianites—to the Ammonites—from which the people were successively delivered. If we can reckon, in each of these instances, the last year of the servitude as the first of the deliverance, the excess is accounted for at once.

Moreover, the probable age of Othniel at the time of his death; which every one will allow might be as great as Joshua's; makes in favour of the same conclusion. It is certain that he must have been under twenty in the year after the Exodus: and it is very

probable that he was not yet forty, at the time of the division of the lands, when he obtained Achsah, the daughter of Caleb, to wife^{x*}. If so, he was not more than forty, B. C. 1514: nor than fifty, B. C. 1504: nor than fifty-five, B. C. 1499: nor than sixty-three, B. C. 1491: nor than one hundred and three, B. C. 1451, about the end of his forty years' judging: which was also the close of his life.

With the dissolution of the Sanhedrim appointed by Moses, the government of the Israelites, as it had been constituted in the wilderness, would properly expire: and with the rise of the first judge, a different description of government, more analogous to that of the prophets or of the kings in aftertimes, would properly begin: and to this beginning, the date in the text, if there is no reason to suspect its soundness, I think may be still referred. Otherwise, the same liberty is open to us, which others have freely taken: and if we admit the probability of an error, and must refer the date to the Exodus, we may boldly change it to five hundred and forty-nine at once. But I prefer the other solution, which preserves the integrity of the text inviolate†. And it is a general argument that the in-

* It makes in favour of these suppositions that Othniel was the son of Kenaz—who is called, Judges iii. 9, the younger brother of Caleb.

† Eusebius, *Chronicon Armeno-Latinum*, Pars i. 162, 163: read in the Septuagint, as we now do, four hundred and forty, and in the Hebrew, four hundred and eighty, for the date in question. It appears also that the Jewish rabbis recognised the latter number; dating it from the Exodus, and attempting to make

it out by not reckoning the years of servitude, in particular instances, as distinct from, but as included in, the years of the judges. Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* viii. iii. 1. has the date 592. Josephus, *Hypomnesticon*, v. cv. 218. the date, 560; both referred to the Exodus. Cf. however, v. cl. 339. Sulpicius Severus, while he recognises the date of the σ' , 440. makes the interval from the Exodus to the beginning of the building of the temple, 588 years: lib. i. 70.

x Joshua xv. 16, 17.

terval between the accession of David, and the death of Joshua, did not exceed four hundred and fifty years, that from the birth of Abishua the son of Phinehas, to the birth of Zadok the son of Ahitub, there were nine generations^y; which at this early period cannot be reckoned at less than forty, or even five and forty years apiece. On this principle the birth of Abishua might almost coincide with the time of the death of Joshua; and the birth of Zadok with the close of the administration of Eli; if not of Samuel. It is possible therefore that Ahitub, the father of Zadok, might have been a child at the beginning of Eli's administration; which if true, would be the best reason why the high priesthood should have passed, for a time, out of the family of Eleazar or Phinehas, into that of Ithamar; and why it should have continued there, until it was restored to its former possessors in the person of Zadok, when Abiathar was deprived of the office by Solomon. Zadok was not only grown up to man's estate, before the reign of David, but the father of sons also arrived at maturity, whose name and agency are both alluded to in its course^z. He is mentioned early in the reign of David, at a time when he could hardly be less than thirty or forty years old; and possibly might be more^a.

We might now be considered to have established our original position on probable grounds; which was the assumption that, both *a priori* and *a posteriori*, no date accords so well to the time of the Exodus from Egypt, as B. C. 1560. To revert however to the subject of the vernal equinox; which we have supposed to fall in that year, between April 5 and April 4:

^y 1 Chron. vi. 4—8. Ezra vii. 2—5.
^a 2 Sam. v. 4, 5. viii. 17.

^z 2 Sam. xv. 36. xvii. 17. xviii. 19.

just as B. C. 4, in the year of the nativity, it fell between March 24 and March 23.

I have met with an ingenious and simple method of calculating vernal equinoxes; contained in a little book written by Gamaliel Smethurst, and entitled *Tables of Time*, and published at Manchester, before the alteration of the style: according to which, B. C. 4. A. M. 4001. Period. Julian. 4710. the sun entered the first point of the equinoctial sign, and the vernal equinox consequently began, on March 22; forty-six seconds, and fifty-four minutes, after nine at night. In other words, the vernal equinox, at the time of the nativity, fell not between March 24 and 23; but between March 22 and 21. Answerable to this distinction, B. C. 1560. Period. Julian. 3154. A. M. 2445. the vernal equinox must have fallen not between April 5 and 4, but between April 3 and 2. And, indeed, according to the method of calculation just referred to, the sun entered the vernal sign in that year on April 3; thirty-four seconds, twenty-eight minutes, after eight at night; that is, the vernal equinox fell on April 3. What then, it will naturally be demanded, becomes of the analogy between the date of the vernal equinox at the time of the Exodus, and the assumed date of the nativity, April 5?

In answer to this question, I must remind the reader that the standard of time, according to which that date of the nativity was calculated, is the Julian year, as first settled and regulated by Julius Cæsar, U. C. 708. B. C. 46, and bearing date from January 1. U. C. 709. B. C. 45: but the true standard of time is neither the Julian—nor any other civil or artificial description of year, but the solar or tropical year alone; which solar or tropical year is measured by the interval taken up in the sun's completion of its annual re-

volution through the twelve signs of the zodiac, from the moment when it enters the first, to the moment when it comes to it again. We know of no fixed or invariable measure of time, but the interval in question. The lunar year is, strictly speaking, an imperfect measure of this; that is, it is the accommodation of twelve or thirteen revolutions about the earth to the duration of this one revolution about the heavens: and the civil year, of every name or constitution, is a purely arbitrary system; which must still be originally founded upon this, and must ultimately be in some manner or other reducible to it.

The Julian year, which since its first institution has never ceased to be the year in use, (at least in Europe, and among Christians of the western division of the Roman empire,) was always intended to be strictly in accommodation to this natural and invariable standard: and had the principles, on which it was founded, been absolutely sure and certain, no contrivance could have been more admirably suited for its purpose. It was assumed, in constructing that year, that the length of the tropical year was exactly 365 days and 6 hours of mean time; whereas its true length is eleven minutes and three seconds or more less than that. On this assumption, the fraction of time in four years exactly amounted to four and twenty hours; and if the length of the civil year, for every three successive years, was to be fixed at 365 days, and for every fourth in order, at 366; it is manifest that, for those three years in order, there never could be a greater difference between any day in the civil year, and the corresponding day in the natural, than eighteen hours; and that both this and the additional difference of six hours more, produced by the revolution of another year, would be exactly compensated by the intercala-

tion of an extra day and night, at the end of the fourth year, and before the fifth.

Yet to the application of this assumption in practice, erroneous as it was in principle, it was previously necessary that the cardinal points in the natural and tropical year (which points are the winter solstice, the vernal equinox, the summer solstice, and the autumnal equinox) should have been accurately determined: otherwise there could be no proper date or beginning at which, and from which, both the natural and the artificial systems of time, which were thenceforward to be adjusted to each other, would begin and proceed in common. These points were determined by Sosigenes, the most eminent mathematician of his day^b; and being so determined, the winter solstice was made to coincide in the newly regulated year with December 25; the vernal equinox with March 25; the summer solstice with June 24; and the autumnal equinox with September 24. Had these dates all been rightly determined, it is manifest that the cardinal points of the tropical year would actually have coincided with the corresponding points of the civil; and the original adjustment of the one to the other, which was necessary to their subsequent agreement, would so far have been complete.

It has been proved, however, by modern calculations, that Sosigenes committed an error in the fixing of his cardinal points: that the real date of the winter solstice, for instance, in the first Julian year as such, was December 23, not December 25; the real date of the vernal equinox was March 22 or 23, not March 25; and so proportionally in the other cases also. Nor was this an improbable contingency, or what he must not have suspected himself: for we are told that he re-

^b Pliny, H. N. xviii. 57. 59. 66. §. 1. 67. §. 3. 68. §. 1. 74.

peated his calculations *thrice*, (*trinis commentationibus*,) and yet was not satisfied with the results after all. It follows then, that the original adjustment of the Julian or civil year to the tropical or natural was not perfect or complete; the former, in its most cardinal points of all, the winter solstice and the vernal equinox, was two days in advance of the latter; and, consequently, a given date in the former, even from its earliest institution, was no exact measure of a corresponding date in the latter. April 5, for instance, in the first Julian year, and much more in any subsequent one, did not express April 5 in the tropical. April 5 in the Julian was properly April 3 in the tropical; and April 5 in the tropical was April 7 in the Julian.

This original error in the Julian year has never been rectified since; and exists now as much as at its first institution. The reformation of the calendar (which means the readjustment of the Julian year to its pristine standard) by Gregory the Thirteenth, A.D. 1582, had no object in view except the restoration of that year to the state in which it was left by the council of Nice, A.D. 325; and having attained that purpose, to provide against any deviations from it for the future. Between A. D. 325, and A. D. 1582, the excess of the civil above the natural year, at the rate of 130 years *per diem*, amounted to nine days complete, and almost a tenth. Gregory compensated for this excess by ordering that the fifth of October should be called the fifteenth; and consequently the eleventh of March the twenty-first: by which means the vernal equinox was again made to fall on March 21, to which it had been fixed by the council of Nice. But if there was any original defect in the civil year, independent of this, and anterior even to the council of Nice itself; it is

clear that this defect was not affected by the correction in question.

Now the date of the vernal equinox, March 21, as fixed by the council of Nice, was almost as much in advance of the true date of this equinox, A. D. 325, as the date of the vernal equinox, March 25. B. C. 45, in the first Julian year as such. It was in fact only a necessary consequence of the assumed date of that equinox, March 24, B. C. 4, when the true date was March 22. For if, B. C. 65, the vernal equinox was supposed to begin to fall on March 24. then, if we reckon forwards at the rate of 130 years to a day, A. D. 325 exactly, it would begin to fall on March 21; whereas the true date of its falling even then was March 20, or 19.

The Gregorian reformation, or what is called the new style in opposition to the old, came immediately into vogue in catholic countries; and it is the style according to which the dates of the eclipses, in the table so often quoted, are all calculated*. Nor did this new style, even from the first, differ from the old, in any thing but the order of the days of the month; (a given day of the month, old style, being necessarily ten days behind the corresponding day, new style;) and also of the days of the week; a given day of the month, new style, being necessarily on a day of the week three days earlier than the same day would have been, old style. It follows, therefore, that even in the tables above quoted, though the dates of the months are the Julian, and the Julian as rectified by the Gregorian correction, yet they retain of necessity the ori-

* For example, mention occurs, Pliny, H. N. ii. 72, of an eclipse of the sun, U. C. 812. A. D. 59. *Pridie Calendas Maias, inter septimam et octavam diei*

horam, for the meridian of Campania; which the Table shews on April 30, for the meridian of Paris.

ginal error of the Julian reckoning—which is that of anticipating by two days the corresponding day of the month in the tropical year. Hence, in the calculation of the paschal full moon, U. C. 750. B. C. 4, as obtained from the eclipse on March 13; which eclipse is determined to that day both in the original calculations of Kepler and Petavius, and in the subsequent calculation of Pingrè*; the date of that full moon, April 11, was virtually April 9; the date of the fourteenth of Nisan, answering to that, was April 8; and the date of the tenth of Nisan was April 4. The true date therefore of our Saviour's nativity, if it was the tenth of Nisan, U. C. 750. B. C. 4, might be nominally April 5 or 6; but it would be really April 3 or 4. It would be April 5 or 6. in the Julian or civil, as adjusted to the tropical year: it would be April 3 or 4. as referred to that year itself. It will follow, therefore, that the true date of the nativity, B. C. 4, might still be the true date of the vernal equinox, B. C. 1560.

A question however yet remains. I have assumed that, in the year of the nativity, the Julian April 5 (which must now be considered as equivalent to the true April 3) fell upon the seventh day of the week: and it may justly be considered a desideratum to the

* The same eclipse was calculated for me by the kindness of Mr. Henry Jenkyns, of Isleworth, Middlesex; whose re-

sults, as adapted to the meridian of Jerusalem, stand as follows:

Julian period, 4710. U. C. 750. B. C. 4.

Moon eclipsed March 13. visible at Jerusalem.

	h.	m.
Beginning of the eclipse . . .	1	49 in the morning.
Middle	3	2
Ecliptic opposition	3	10
End	4	14

Digits eclipsed 4 51

On this principle the moon passover would be celebrated would be at the full again, April April 10.
11. 3.46. afternoon: and the

completeness of our proof, that we should be able to demonstrate, with such probable certainty as the subject admits of, that April 3, B. C. 1560, fell on the seventh day also. And, if we are only at liberty to conjecture that the year of the Exodus coincided with B. C. 1560, and the tenth of Nisan in that year with April 3; this, I think, may be proved.

First, if we compare Numbers xxxiii. 1—8. with Exodus xii. 37. xiii. 20. xiv. 2. 9. 13. 19. 20, 21. 24. 27. it will be considered certain that, as the people left Egypt on the fifteenth of Nisan, and journeyed that day from Rameses to Succoth; so they journeyed on the next day from Succoth to Etham, and on the third day* from Etham to Pi-hahiroth; opposite to the quarter where it was designed by Providence that they should cross the Red sea. Moreover it will appear that, in turning from Etham to Pi-hahiroth, they deviated from the line of their course until then; and in some measure retraced their steps: which renders it less surprising that the same day, before the evening, they were overtaken by the host of the Egyptians. On the same night after they were overtaken, the sea was made to go back by a strong east wind; the pillar of fire, which until then had preceded the course of the Israelites, turned and came into their rear; before the night was passed they were commanded to enter the sea; in the morning-watch God began to trouble the host of the Egyptians; and when the morning returned (the people being now safely landed on the Arabian shore) the sea was restored to its strength, and the deliverance of the Israelites was complete. The departure from Rameses then took place on the morning of the fifteenth of

* Josephus likewise supposes the third day. Ant. Jud. ii. them to arrive at Pi-hahiroth on xv. 1.

Nisan ; and the passage of the Red sea, as it may be with reason conjectured, on the night of the seventeenth, or the evening of the Jewish eighteenth.

Now the passage of the Red sea by the Israelites, and the overthrow of the Egyptians in its waters, have been considered by the Church in all ages to be a striking emblem of Christian baptism, and of the spiritual conquest which was achieved by Christ in his resurrection from the dead. It is not inconsistent with this analogy that, as our Lord rose again on the first day of the week, so the passage of the Red sea took place on the same. And if the tenth of Nisan fell on the Saturday, this must actually have been the case ; for the seventeenth would fall on the Saturday also, and therefore the eighteenth upon the Sunday. The analogy is, perhaps, even closer than this ; for as God began to trouble the Egyptians first with the arrival of the *morning* watch, and brought back the sea upon them finally when the morning appeared ; so was it between these same limits that our Saviour arose from the dead ; not before the one, and yet not after the other.

Again, if we refer to Exodus xvi. 1. it will be seen that, on the fifteenth day of the second month, after the departure from Egypt, the people arrived in the wilderness of Sin. On the evening next after this arrival, they were supplied with the quails ; on the morning after that with the manna ; and on the sixth day, *exclusive* of this morning, was the first of the sabbaths as such^c. Nothing, I think, can be more probable than the inference from these facts, viz. that the people arrived at Sin on the morning of the *last* day of one week ; and were first supplied with

^c Exod. xvi. 6. 8. 12. 13. 22, 23. 27.

manna on the morning of the *first* day of the next. If so, the fifteenth of the second month was a Saturday; and therefore so were the eighth and the first. Consequently, if the month before this, the month of the Exodus, contained thirty days, (which would be certain, if the year of Moses was still solar or Egyptian^d, and not absolutely improbable even though it was already converted into a lunar one;) the twenty-fourth, the seventeenth, the tenth days of that month, respectively, must all have coincided with the seventh day of the week. In other words, the lamb for the first passover was originally set apart, B. C. 1560, in the year of the Exodus, on the same day of the week, and on the same day of the month on which Christ, who was always adumbrated by that victim, was ultimately born, B. C. 4, in the year of the nativity. This conclusion may be further confirmed as follows.

As I acknowledge no true measure of time but the revolution of the tropical year; so do I acknowledge no true division of weeks but the succession of days in that year; to which, it is manifest, no criterion is applicable like the solar cycle of twenty-eight years, (a cycle intended for the Julian year exclusively,) but only the simple and natural one of the reduction of years into days and nights, or *νυχθήμερα*, and of days and nights, or *νυχθήμερα*, into weeks. With this view I will assume for the present that, according to Sir Isaac Newton's computation, the mean length of the solar or tropical year is three hundred and sixty-five days, five hours, forty-eight minutes, and fifty-seven seconds.

It has been demonstrated by the celebrated astronomer La Place^e, that about B. C. 4004. was the era of

^d Compare in proof of this, Gen. vii. 11. viii. 4. vii. 24. viii. 3.

^e *Mécanique Céleste*, vi. x. 31.

a grand astronomical epoch ; viz. of the time when the axis major of the earth's orbit coincided with the line of the equinoxes ; and consequently when, at the vernal and the autumnal equinoxes respectively, the year was equally divided, or the summer half of the earth's annual revolution was exactly of the same length as the winter. This equality has not subsisted since : on the contrary, it has been gradually varying ; so that the former of those periods is now more than a week longer than the latter. The period in question, then, from which this inequality begins to proceed, or before which it cannot be proved to have existed, may justly be regarded as a grand astronomical epoch ; and it furnishes no slight confirmation to the conclusion, otherwise obtained, that the same year, B. C. 4004, was (as the Bible chronology assumes it to be) the first year of creation, answering to A. M. 1. For if the effect in question might *a priori* be expected to exist at any time, in general ; it would most reasonably be expected to exist at the time of the creation, in particular.

Assuming then, that A. M. 1. and B. C. 4004. both which correspond to the year of the Julian period, 710, coincided together, we may calculate, by the help of the method alluded to above, that the sun entered the equinoctial sign of the vernal quarter, A. M. 1, upon April 22 ; not earlier than twelve, nor later than six in the afternoon. Now, it is a possible case that, as the first production of light and its separation from darkness were so far the beginning of the revolution of days and nights—and as it is reasonable to conclude that, at their first separation, the day and the night were equal—so both this production and this separation coincided, in the year of creation, with the time of the vernal equinox. Nor would it be any objection

that the sun itself was not created until four days afterwards. The revolution of days and nights had begun four days before; and it is no anomaly to say that, in the year of creation, before the sun itself was in being, the year was four days old. I will assume, then, that the revolution of days and nights, or rather of $\nu\chi\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$, or days and nights as such, begins from the date of the vernal equinox, A. M. 1; about six in the evening of April 22. Let us now consider on what day the third of April, taking its rise from this point of departure, would be likely to fall A. M. 2445, in the year of the Exodus from Egypt.

	days.	h.	m.	s.
2000 tropical years =	730484	15	40	0
400	146096	22	20	0
40	14609	16	38	0
4	1460	23	15	48
<hr/>				
2444	892652	5	53	48
<hr/>				

These days being reduced to weeks = 127521 weeks, five days and nights, five hours, fifty-three minutes, and forty-eight seconds; which fraction of time (for a reason which will appear by and by) being neglected, the excess is reduced to five days exactly. Hence, if A. M. 1, the first $\nu\chi\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$ of the first week began upon April 22, about sunset; A. M. 2445, the first $\nu\chi\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$ of the 127522d week began at the same time upon April 17: consequently, April 17 was a Saturday; and therefore April 10 and April 3.

In like manner 4000 tropical years = 1460969 days, seven hours, twenty minutes; that is, 208709 weeks, six days and nights, seven hours, and twenty minutes; or as before, six days and nights merely. For Sir Isaac Newton's mean length of the tropical year differs from that of Delambre, which comprises the result of

the most laborious and accurate of modern observations, by an excess of about six seconds; which excess, in the lapse of four thousand years, will amount, as nearly as possible, to the fraction of time in question.

Hence as before; if A. M. 1, the first $\nu\chi\theta\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ of the first week began about sunset on April 22*; A. M. 4001, in the year of the nativity, the first $\nu\chi\theta\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ of the 208710th week would begin about the same time on April 16; that is, April 16 would be Saturday, and therefore April 9 and April 2 also.

It is true, we have endeavoured to prove that A. M. 4001, in the year of the nativity, not April 2, but April 3, was Saturday; from which conclusion what we have just arrived at differs by a day. When it is considered, however, that these calculations were founded on the *mean* length of the tropical year, which *mean* length has not yet been exactly settled, and, beginning from the time of Sir Isaac Newton, the more strictly it has since been ascertained, the more it requires to be *reduced* not *increased* in its amount; even this approximation to the truth may appear as near a coincidence as the nature of the case admits of. The mean length, whether of the solar or of the lunar

* The rate of precession for the vernal equinox, which according to the standard of Newton was eleven minutes three seconds annually, will be eleven minutes nine seconds annually according to that of Delambre. But this difference will not affect the truth of the calculation that A. M. 1, the date of the vernal equinox was April 22, if B. C. 4 it really fell on March 22. In four thousand years the rate of precession according to Delambre, at the mean ratio of eleven minutes nine seconds an-

nually, would accumulate to forty-four thousand six hundred minutes; or seven hundred and forty-three hours, twenty minutes; which are equal to thirty days and nights, twenty-three hours, and twenty minutes, or what we may call thirty-one days and nights in all. Hence if the date of the vernal equinox A. M. 1 was April 22 at a certain time, the date of the vernal equinox A. M. 4001, B. C. 4, would be March 22 at the same time, within forty minutes of defect only.

motions, is the only fixed standard by which they can be reduced to calculation at all; and yet the mean length in the case of motions, which are perpetually varying more or less, can never at a given time be an exact measure of the true: nor is it an impossible contingency that, though A. M. 4001, the mean solar motion would make the second of April fall on the Saturday, it might actually have fallen on the Friday.

This liability to a difference between *mean* motions and *actual* motions is greater for small periods of time than for large. In the present instance, the excess appears to have been generated in the interim of time between A. M. 2445, the year of the Exodus, and A. M. 4001, the year of the nativity; an interval of 1556 years. For 1556 tropical years = 568317 days, one hour, twenty-six minutes, twelve seconds; or 81188 weeks, and one day, one hour, twenty-six minutes, twelve seconds over; that is, if we deduct two hours, thirty-five minutes, and thirty-six seconds, for the excess of the Newtonian standard of the length of the tropical year above that of Delambre, as accumulated in 1556 years—more than one hour less than an entire day. Hence, if A. M. 2445, April 3 truly fell on Saturday; A. M. 4001 it would be within twenty-three hours of falling upon Saturday again. And even this is some approximation to a coincidence with that day at least.

It is, however, to be remembered that our Saviour's birthday, considered in its connection with the Jewish passover, was the tenth of Nisan; and the tenth of Nisan, like every other Jewish *νυχθήμερον*, does not admit of being expressed by any single Julian or tropical day, which cannot be regarded as a *νυχθήμερον* as well as it. The tenth of Nisan in any year would be coincident with parts of two Julian or tropical

days; and an event which happened on the tenth of Nisan, might be so far considered to belong in common to both. Hence the birthday of our Lord, A. M. 4001, if it can be determined to the tenth of Nisan in that year, and the tenth of Nisan can be proved to coincide partly with the second and partly with the third of the tropical April in the same year, may be said to be either the former or the latter, *pro re nata*; the former, if the precise time of the nativity was the evening, the latter, if it was the morning, of the corresponding Jewish day. Now this, as I hinted in the Twelfth Dissertation, vol. i. p. 402, seems actually to have been the case; and the true time of the nativity to have been the midnight of the Jewish tenth of Nisan; which midnight would almost coincide with the tropical 3rd of April. The same thing appears to have held good with the original separation of the lamb for the passover, A. M. 2445; which, as there can be no question, was some time on the tenth of Nisan. The tenth of Nisan in that year, it has been proved, fell on the Saturday, and on the 3rd of April; and it may also be proved that it must have *expired* on that day, not *begun* upon it, which will render the coincidence so much the more complete. For if the *fifteenth* of the second month expired on the Saturday, the *tenth* of the first must have done the same. And as the time of setting apart the lamb was appointed to some time on the *tenth*, four days before its sacrifice on the *fourteenth*, it is to be presumed it was required to be set apart, on the former, about the same time at which it was required to be sacrificed, on the latter; that is, between the evenings, or towards the close of a Jewish *νυχθήμερον*, in the one case as well as in the other*.

* Should any one still consider it a difficulty that the result of our calculations concerning the succession of days and

To proceed then with the course of our inquiry ; I

nights, for the latter part of the period between the Creation and the birth of Christ, does not square so exactly with the true place of the third of April in the year of the Nativity ; as the former part squared with the assumption of its place in the year of the Exodus : perhaps the following considerations may contribute to mitigate this difficulty, if they do not remove it altogether.

The calculation, for each of the periods in question, proceeded upon the supposition, that the succession of days and nights, between the Creation and the Exodus, and between the Exodus and the Nativity, went on alike ; and that the mean length of one *νυχθήμερον* was always the same with the mean length of another : a supposition which, with respect to the first of the intervals so determined, there is no reason whatever to consider doubtful. But with respect to the latter ; there were two occasions, one in the time of Joshua, B. C. 1520, the other in the reign of Hezekiah ^a, B. C. 710, when the constant, unvaried, and uniform succession of days and nights did experience some interruption ; the nature and effect of which will best be estimated by considering what would have been the case if it had never happened.

Between a certain *νυχθήμερον*,

B. C. 1560, *inclusive*, and the same *νυχθήμερον* in the time of Joshua, B. C. 1520, *exclusive*, there would be forty natural years ; or 14,609 days and nights, sixteen hours, which I shall consider equivalent to another day and night : and consequently, 2087 weeks, and one day of another. Let this *νυχθήμερον*, for argument's sake, be assumed as April 1, which B. C. 1560 fell upon Thursday ; and therefore B. C. 1520 would fall upon Friday. In this case, the next *νυχθήμερον*, April 2, ought to have fallen on Saturday ; and if the succession of *νυχθήμερα* went on as before, it would fall upon Saturday.

But let it be further supposed, for argument's sake also, that the miracle in the time of Joshua was wrought upon Friday ; and that upon Friday, April 1. The effect of this miracle was that one day as such was prolonged to the length of two ; that is, a day of twelve hours was made a day of twenty-four ^b—without affecting the day of the month, or the day of the week ; (for April 1 did not thereby become April 2, nor Friday become Saturday ;) but only the absolute length of one individual *νυχθήμερον*, compared with what the length of every *νυχθήμερον* was before, and what it continued to be afterwards. The *actual* April 1 was Friday, and the *actual* April 2 was Satur-

^a Josh. x. 12—14. 2 Kings xx. 8—11. 2 Chron. xxxii. 31. ^b The author of the book of Ecclesiasticus says the same thing of this day in the time of Joshua : ch. xlv. 4. So likewise Justin Martyr, Dialogus, 419. l. 15. and Dionysius the Areopagite, Epistola vii. Ad Polycarpum. Operum ii. 90. and the Scholia of Maximus, Ibid. 94, 95.

shall mention only one circumstance more and then conclude.

day; but the *actual* length of that *νυχθήμερον*, of which this April 1 was a part, was twelve hours greater than usual.

If then a stranger to this effect were calculating the succession of days and nights *from* a certain date, before the time of this anomaly, *up* to a certain date after it; and calculating it upon the supposition that they had always gone on alike, and had always been of uniform length; it is manifest that he would arrive at a conclusion which would be true in theory, but false in fact; viz. that a given *νυχθήμερον* of calculated time began *twelve* hours later than the same portion of actual time did. He would suppose, for instance, that the *νυχθήμερον* expressed by April 1, B. C. 1520, was an ordinary *νυχθήμερον* of twenty-four hours; whereas it was an extraordinary one of *thirty-six*: and that the next *νυχθήμερον*, expressed by April 2, began as usual at the expiration of *twenty-four* hours of actual time; whereas it did not begin until the expiration of *thirty-six*. Twelve hours of the *calculated second* of April were merged in the *actual first*; and instead of coinciding with Saturday, actually made a part of Friday. But one who was ignorant of this anomaly would suppose they made part of the Saturday, and he would compute them accordingly; that is, his calculated April 2 would be supposed to begin twelve hours later than the *νυχθήμερον* which it expressed. His calculated April 2 would be reckoned to belong wholly to

Saturday, whereas in reality twelve hours of it were merged in the Friday.

If the effect which ensued in the time of Joshua was repeated in the time of Hezekiah, then another twelve hours of time, which should belong to the calculated *νυχθήμερον*, would be merged in the actual *νυχθήμερον* immediately before it; and both these anomalies together would produce this effect: that reckoning from a certain date *before* the time of Joshua to a certain date *after* the time of Hezekiah, and ignorant of each of these miracles, I should suppose a certain calculated *νυχθήμερον* (we will suppose the third of April) to have been wholly coincident with a certain day of the week, (we will assume the Sunday,) when in fact it was wholly merged in the day before it. That is to say, ever after the miracle in the time of Hezekiah, the actual place of a given *νυχθήμερον* which I might calculate to be Sunday, would be truly the Saturday.

On this principle, April 3, B. C. 4, the place of which was found by calculation to be Sunday, would actually be Saturday; that is to say, the first *νυχθήμερον* of the 208, 710th week, from the Creation, B. C. 4004, which I calculated to begin at sunset on the Sunday, B. C. 4, did actually begin at sunset on the Saturday, B. C. 4: and if I must call that *νυχθήμερον* April 3, then April 3, which I supposed to be Sunday, was in reality Saturday. Now it makes no difference whether

In the second year after the Exodus^f, A. M. 2446, B. C. 1559, on the first day of the first month, the Tabernacle being complete in all its parts, was set up; and either at the same time or soon afterwards the Tabernacle service must have begun. On the fourteenth day ensuing the first Levitical passover was celebrated in its season. It is a natural and obvious question, On what day of the week this celebration would fall? in answer to which I think it is capable of proof that the passover fell in the year after the Exodus, relatively to the days of the week, exactly as it had fallen in the year of the Exodus itself. If so, the same must have been the case with the tenth of Nisan.

In order to this proof I shall assume only, that from the time of the commencement of the Levitical service, the year of the Jews must necessarily be considered lunar, whatsoever it was before; and therefore, that the celebration of the passover, in this year, must have coincided with the full of the moon, whatsoever had been the case in the year before it. The fourteenth of Nisan, in the year after the Exodus, A. M. 2446, or B. C. 1559, would be determined by the paschal full moon, and either fall on the same day with that, or immediately before it; and the paschal full moon

we were ignorant of the anomalies in question, or did not take them into account: which yet was the case when I instituted the calculation given above. It is not surprising, then, that the ultimate result did not square with the truth; but was found to be a whole *νυχθήμερον* in excess. The difference is now explained; for the above course of reasoning, I think, must be al-

lowed to be just: and perhaps this very difference between the matter of fact, and the result of calculations which would otherwise be true, is some confirmation reflexively of the truth of the miracles which produced it; miracles indeed attested by certain obscure traditions of profane history itself. Vide Herodotus, ii. 142. Pomponius Mela, i. 9.

^f Exod. xl. 2. 17. Numb. ix. 3. 5.

would be determined by the vernal equinox, and either coincide with that, or at the utmost precede or follow it within certain limits, such as appear to have held good subsequently. For there is no reason why the same rule, in this respect, which prevailed in the time of our Saviour, when the vernal equinox fell upon March 22, should not be considered admissible at any period before that, when the date of the same equinox was proportionally more in advance. If the vernal equinox was supposed to be arrived six or seven days before its true date at one time, it might be supposed arrived at the same distance of time before its true date at another. Hence, if when that date was nominally March 24, and actually March 22, the pass-over might still be celebrated on March 18, it is only in accordance with the principle of such an usage, that when the date of the vernal equinox was nominally April 5, and actually April 3, the passover might yet be celebrated on March 30.

Now, on the principle of the lunar and the solar revolutions, between which, for periods of years which are multiples of nineteen, the number of years in a Metonic cycle—a certain ratio is known to prevail; it may be proved that if the moon was at the full, for the meridian of Jerusalem, at 3. 2. in the morning, March 13 in the Julian year, or March 11 in the corresponding tropical year, B. C. 4; it must have been at the full for the meridian of Alexandria in Egypt, at 11. 24. in the morning on April 1 in the Julian year, or March 30 in the tropical, B. C. 1559. The details of this proof I have thrown into the margin *. But if

* The statement of the proof is as follows:

In nineteen tropical years, or two hundred and thirty-five lu-

nations, the revolution of the sun is found to anticipate that of the moon by two hours, four minutes, and nineteen seconds.

that was the case, it is manifestly possible that the passover might be celebrated on March 30, and there-

	days.	h.	m.	s.
For 235 lunations	= 6939	16	32	28
And 19 tropical years of Delambre	= 6939	14	28	9

Sun's Anticipation	=	2	4	19
--------------------------	---	---	---	----

This difference must be *added* to a given time of the moon's age in reckoning forwards; and deducted from it in reckoning *backwards*.

Now in 19×12 or 228 years, the Anticipation	h.	m.	s.
in question	= 24	48	228
And in 228×6 or 1368 years it	= 24×6	288	1368
In 19×4 or 76 years it	= 8	16	76
In 76×2 it	= 16	32	152
In 19×2 it	= 4	8	38
Now $1558 = 228 \times 6 + 76 \times 2 + 19 \times 2$	d.	h.	m.
Hence in 1558 years the Anticipation	= 7	1	53

Now, the hours being reckoned from midnight, let the moon be supposed at the full, B. C. 4, for the meridian of Jerusalem, on

	d.	h.	m.
March	13	3	2
Add an half lunation	14	18	22

Moon new at Jerusalem, March	27	21	24
Deduct			12

New moon at Alexandria, March	27	21	12
	d.	h.	m.

Deduct from March	27	21	12	0
The Anticipation for 1558 years	7	1	53	58

Moon new at Alexandria, B. C. 1562. March	20	19	18	2
-------------------------------------------	----	----	----	---

Let B. C. 1562. be considered the first of a series of Metonic cycles—B. C. 1559. is the *third* year of that cycle complete, or the beginning of the fourth. To obtain the moon's epact at the end of her third year from the beginning of a cycle, we must proceed thus:

Mean difference of one lunar and one solar year,	d.	h.	m.	s.
exclusive of seconds	= 10	21	0	0
Multiply by three	3			
Mean difference of three lunar and three solar				
years	= 32	15	0	0
Deduct one lunation	29	12	44	0
Moon's epact in the third year	= 3	2	16	0

fore that the fourteenth of Nisan might coincide with March 30. If so, it would fall upon the fourth day of the week, or Wednesday: and consequently the tenth of Nisan on the seventh, or the Saturday. For if, in the year of Exodus, the third of April fell on the Saturday, then, in the year after the Exodus, it would fall on the Sunday: and if April 3 in that year was a Sunday, March 30, before it, must have been a Wednesday.

On this principle, if Nisan 14. March 30. was a Wednesday, Nisan 1. March 17. was a Thursday: and if the Tabernacle was set up on that day, it was set up on the Thursday^g. But it would not follow from this fact that the Tabernacle service began on the Thursday. The business of setting up the Tabernacle, which was preliminary to that commencement, might occupy one or two days' time; and the actual commencement of the service might not take place until the Saturday; that is, until the third of Nisan. There are many reasons to render it probable that the Levitical service would originally begin either with the evening of the Sabbath, or the evening of the first day of the week; and we saw in Dissertation xii. vol. i. p. 413, that it appears to have finally ceased on one of those two days in particular. This fact seems to me to be intimated in the account which is given of the offerings of the princes, or heads of the tribes^h; which began as soon as the

	d.	h.	m.	s.
Deduct this epact from March	20	19	18	2
when the moon was new B. C. 1562.	3	2	16	0
<hr/>				
B. C. 1559. moon was new, March	17	17	2	2
Add an half lunation.	14	18	22	0
<hr/>				
Full moon, B. C. 1559, April	1	11	24	2

^g Exod. xl. 2. 17. 34. Numb. ix. 15.

^h Numb. vii. 1—88.

erection and consecration of the Tabernacle were duly completed, and which lasted for twelve days in order. It is reasonable to suppose that all this began and continued so as to be over before the time when the passover was celebrated; that is, before the fourteenth day of the month: and therefore, that it began and was completed between the first and the fourteenth, after the one, but before the otherⁱ. In this case, nothing is more probable than that it began on the second of Nisan, which would be on the Friday; and ended on the thirteenth, which would coincide with the Tuesday.

Moreover it appears from Numbers x. 11—33. that after all these things the cloud was first removed from the Tabernacle on the twentieth of the second month; and the people journeyed subsequently without interruption until the twenty-third. It is an obvious conjecture that this stopping at the end of a three days' journey, beginning with the twentieth of Jar, was for the sake of the rest on the sabbath; which would thus coincide with the twenty-third. And if the fourteenth of Nisan fell on the Wednesday, and Nisan now consisted of twenty-nine days, this conjecture would be true; for the twenty-first and twenty-eighth of Nisan, the sixth, the thirteenth, and the twentieth, of Jar would necessarily be Wednesdays also; and therefore the twenty-third would be a Saturday. We may collect too from Numbers xi. 18. 31, 32. that the supply of the quails, which ensued so soon after the arrival at Taberah, ensued on the twenty-fourth: and consequently on the first day of the week. In this case the supply of quails, like that of manna, took place on the first day of the week in this year, as that had taken place on the first day of the week the year before it:

ⁱ Numb. ix. 1. 2—5.

and this upon the twenty-fourth, as that did upon the sixteenth of the same month.

It constitutes no difficulty, that we suppose the fourteenth of the Jewish Nisan to fall, in two successive years, on the same day of the week. This could not be the case with any day in the solar year, nor with any day in the lunar, as such; but it might be the case with a day which made part of a solar year in one year, and part of a lunar in the next: which, as we have already observed, was probably true of the fourteenth of Nisan in the year before, and the year after the Exodus respectively. A. M. 2445, B. C. 1560, the fourteenth of Nisan, if we are right in the conclusions established, coincided with the seventh of April; and A. M. 2446, B. C. 1559, with the thirtieth of March: both of which must have fallen on the Wednesday if either of them did so. If, however, A. M. 2446, B. C. 1559, the moon was at the full on March 30. 11. 24. in the morning; A. M. 2445, B. C. 1560, it was at the full ten days, twenty-one hours, before that; viz. April 10. 8. 24. in the morning. This day would answer to the seventeenth of Nisan, and both would fall on the Saturday. They would coincide also with the day when the passage of the Red sea took place; at which time, it might almost be conjectured from Exod. xiv. 19, 20. Joshua xxiv. 7. that the night was light, or the moon was at the full.

Moreover, if B. C. 1559, A. M. 2446, the new moon of Nisan fell on the tropical March 15; then after the lapse of thirty-nine years, B. C. 1520, A. M. 2485, the year of the Eisodus, it admits of proof that it would fall on April 3*: that is, in the year of the Eisodus, the

* This computation will stand as follows:				
	d.	h.	m.	s.
B. C. 1559. A. M. 2446. New moon, March	15	17	2	2
Anticipation to be added for two				
Metonic cycles or 38 years				
		4	8	38

neomenia of Nisan coincided with the vernal equinox, which still fell upon that day as before. It may be proved also that they both coincided with the first day of the week. For if A. M. 2446, April 3 fell on the Sunday, then A. M. 2474, after *one* solar cycle, it would fall on the Sunday again; and A. M. 2485, at the end of the *eleventh* year of a *second*, its place would again be Sunday. This too would be an observable coincidence; for as the entrance into the promised land, after a forty years' wandering in the wilderness, was so far a new epoch in the history of the Jews; what fitter conjuncture of circumstances could be selected to characterise that epoch, than the time when the neomenia of Nisan, the vernal equinox, and the first day of the week all appear to have fallen out together?

	d.	m.	m.	s.
B. C. 1521. A. M. 2484. New moon, March	15	21	10	40
Deduct for one year's epact	10	21	0	0
<hr/>				
B. C. 1520. A. M. 2485. New moon, March	5	0	10	40
Add one mean lunation	29	12	44	0
<hr/>				
Moon new again, April	3	12	54	40

According to the method of calculation, before referred to, the sun entered the vernal sign in the same year, on April 3. 13. 6. 34. the hours, in each instance, being reckoned from midnight.

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION XII.

On the Chronology of the Kingdoms of Judah and of Israel.

Vide Appendix, Dissertation xi. *supra*.

THE chronology of the kings of Judah, from Solomon downwards, and as far as they run parallel with each other, that of the kings of Israel, upon which I did not enter in the preceding Dissertation, is yet of so much importance, and encumbered with so many difficulties, that its consideration may justly be pronounced a desideratum. I trust, therefore, that no apology will be requisite for devoting to this subject the following pages.

I shall assume for the present, that no more is known of the chronology in question than the data already established: viz. that the first of Solomon coincided with B. C. 1014, and the fourteenth of Hezekiah, either wholly or in part, with B. C. 710; and therefore his first, either wholly or in part, with B. C. 724. The first of Hezekiah then, B. C. 724, being considered as an intermediate period, the two following Tables will exhibit a synopsis of the order and succession of the reigns in question, of their *Scriptural* or historical lengths, and of the years before Christ in which they began, from the first of Solomon to the last of Zedekiah.

TABLE FIRST.

KINGS OF JUDAH.			KINGS OF ISRAEL.		
	Years.	B. C.		Years.	B. C.
I. Solomon	40	1014			
II. Rehoboam	17	974	I. Jeroboam	22	974

KINGS OF JUDAH.			KINGS OF ISRAEL.		
	Years.	B. C.		Years.	B. C.
III. Abijam	3	957			
IV. Asa	41	955			
			II. Nadab	2	953
			III. Baasha	24	952
			IV. Elah	2	929
			V. Zimri <i>seven days</i>	}	928
			VI. Omri	12	
			VII. Ahab	22	917
V. Jehoshaphat	25	914			
			VIII. Ahaziah	2	896
			IX. Jehoram	12	895
VI. Jehoram	8	890			
VII. Ahaziah	1	883			
VIII. Athaliah	6	882	X. Jehu	28	882
IX. Joash	40	876			
			XI. Jehoahaz	17	854
			XII. Jehoash	16	838
X. Amaziah	29	836			
			XIII. Jeroboam ii.	41	822
XI. Uzziah	52	807			
			XIV. Zachariah <i>six months</i>		769
			XV. Shallum <i>one month</i>		768
			XVI. Menahem	10	768
			XVII. Pekahiah	2	758
			XVIII. Pekah	20	756
XII. Jotham	16	755			
XIII. Ahaz	16	739			
			XIX. Hoshea	9	727
XIV. Hezekiah	—	724			

TABLE SECOND.

KINGS OF JUDAH.

	Years.	B. C.
XIV. Hezekiah.....	29	724
XV. Manasseh.....	55	695
XVI. Amon	2	641

	Years.	B.C.
XVII. Josiah.....	31	640
XVIII. Jehoahaz <i>three months</i>		609
XIX. Jehoiakim	11	609
XX. Jehoiachin <i>three months ten days</i>		598
XXI. Zedekiah.....	11	598
Eleventh of Zedekiah.....		588

With regard to the verification of these Tables; the great practical difficulty concerns the absolute lengths of the reigns ascribed to each particular king, and the synchronisms of particular years of one reign with particular years of another. Nor can any single rule be devised which will apply alike to each, and reconcile them both together. But it is an obvious possibility that the lengths of the reigns might be reckoned by *one* rule, and the synchronisms by *another*; that the former, for instance, might be referred to some nominal ἀρχή—and the latter to a true. This distinction, in my opinion, does actually hold good: the lengths of the reigns are referred in every instance to a nominal ἀρχή, but the synchronisms to the true. The reign of every king, where the contrary is not distinctly specified, is supposed to begin and to end with *Nisan*; the *first* month in the sacred year. Hence the years of their reigns are necessarily reckoned as full years; and current years are taken for complete. But no synchronism is ever referred except to the true date of the reigns in question, or to the month in which they actually began. If there is any doubt as to the existence of this double rule, I think it will be entirely removed by the analytical examination of each particular reign in its order.

First, then, as the reign of Solomon has been shewn to have begun in the spring, so, from 1 Kings xii. 1. 3. 5. 12. 20. 25—33. may it be collected that it terminated in the spring: and, consequently, that he reigned

forty years complete. On this principle both the true and the nominal ἀρχὴ of Rehoboam, and by parity of consequence of Jeroboam, alike will bear date from Nisan, B. C. 974. Hence the following synchronisms,

1 of Rehoboam.	1 of Jeroboam.	Nisan B. C. 974—973.
17	17	958—957.

Now^a the *first* of Abijam began in the *eighteenth* of Jeroboam: whence it seems a reasonable inference that Rehoboam reigned *seventeen* years complete.

Hence, again as before, both nominally and truly,

1 of Abijam.	18 of Jeroboam.	Nisan B. C. 957—956.
3	20	955—954.

Now Abijam could not have reigned more than *two* years and part of a *third* year; for as *his* reign began in the *eighteenth*, so did Asa's^b in the *twentieth*, of Jeroboam. We may suppose, then, that he died about the middle of his *third* year, the Tisri, B. C. 955. The first year of Asa, therefore, will bear date *truly* from Tisri, but *nominally* from Nisan, B. C. 955: both in the *twentieth* of Jeroboam.

Hence 1 of Asa. 20 of Jeroboam. Nisan B. C. 955—954.

3	22	953—952.
---------	----------	----------

Now the *first* of Nadab began in the *second* of Asa^c; yet the *first* of Asa had begun in the *twentieth* of Jeroboam. Both these statements would be true, if Jeroboam died *in* his twenty-second year, after the *Nisan*, but before the *Tisri*, B. C. 953. For, then, the *first* of Nadab would truly begin in the *second* of Asa, sometime before Tisri, B. C. 953.

Hence 3 of Asa. 1 of Nadab. Nisan B. C. 953—952.

4	2	952—951.
---------	---------	----------

Now Nadab died in the *third* of Asa^d, though he began to reign in his *second*. If so, Nadab did not reign

^a 1 Kings xv. 1. 2. xiv. 21. ² Chron. xiii. 1. ^b 1 Kings xv. 9. ^c Ibid. xv. 25. ^d Ibid. xv. 28.

two years complete: and if he died *in* his second year, after the Nisan, but before the Tisri, B. C. 952, both *he* would die, and Baasha begin to reign^e, truly in the third of Asa; before the Tisri, B. C. 952.

Hence 4 of Asa. 1 of Baasha. Nisan B. C. 952—951.

26 23 930—929.

27 24 929—928.

Now the *first* of Elah ^f began in the *twenty-sixth* of Asa: and this would be truly the case if Baasha died *in* his nominal *twenty-fourth*, after the Nisan, but before the Tisri, B. C. 929, in the *true* twenty-sixth of Asa.

And hence it is an obvious inference that the numeral notes at 2 Chron. xv. 19. and xvi. 1, which speak of the thirty-fifth and the thirty-sixth of Asa, respectively, the former of peace between Israel and Judah *up* to that year, the latter of an invasion of Judah by Baasha, as made *in* that year, are corrupt, the one for the twenty-fifth, and the other for the twenty-sixth; in which case, but in which only, they might both be consistent with the truth. Compare Josephus, Ant. viii. xi. 4. xii. 1—6.

Again, 27 of Asa. 1 of Elah. Nisan B. C. 929—928.

28 2 928—927.

Now Elah died in the *twenty-seventh* of Asa^g: and this might be the case if he died in his *nominal second*, after the Nisan, but before the Tisri, B. C. 928: for that might thus be in the *true* *twenty-seventh* of Asa.

After the death of Elah, besides the seven days of Zimri, there was an interregnum of *four* years in length^h, perhaps taken up by the contest between Tibni and Omri; which extended from the *true* twenty-

^e 1 Kings xv. 33. ^f Ibid. xvi. 8. ^g Ibid. xvi. 10. 15. ^h Ibid. xvi. 15. 23.

seventh, to the *true* thirty-first of Asa. But this is included in the *twelve* years ascribed to Omri.

Hence 28 of Asa. 1 of Omri. Nisan B. C. 928—927.

39 12 917—916.

Now it is manifestly possible that Omri might die in his twelfth year *incomplete*; soon after Nisan, B. C. 917. In this case the reign of Ahab would actually begin in the true *thirty-eighth* of Asaⁱ, which would not expire until Tisri B. C. 917.

Hence 39 of Asa. 1 of Ahab. Nisan B. C. 917—916.

41 3 915—914.

Now that Asa did not reign forty-one years *complete* may be inferred from 2 Chron. xvi. 13; which says that he died *in* his forty-first year. But it follows most clearly from 1 Kings xxii. 41, which makes the *first* of Jehoshaphat to begin in the *fourth* of Ahab. I infer, then, that Asa died at the *end* of his *nominal*, but the *middle* of his *true*, forty-first, Nisan B. C. 914: which might also be truly *in* the *fourth* of Ahab.

Hence 1 of Jehosh. 4 of Ahab. Nisan B. C. 914—913.

19 22 896—895.

The twenty-second of Ahab must thus have synchronised with the nineteenth of Jehoshaphat; and if Ahab did not reign twenty-two years complete, he would die *in* his twenty-second year, after the Nisan, B. C. 896. The circumstances of his death, which was in battle against the Syrians, render it almost certain that it took place in the spring quarter of the year, at the time *when kings go out to battle*: in which case, if he began to reign, as we have seen, about Nisan, B. C. 917, either he must have reigned more than twenty-two years, or he must have died in his twenty-second year, not long after Nisan, B. C. 896.

ⁱ 1 Kings xvi. 23. 29.

On this principle the reign of his successor would begin in the *nineteenth* of Jehoshaphat: yet, 1 Kings xxii. 40. 51, it is made to begin in the *seventeenth*; and, 2 Kings iii. 1, the first of Jehoram his successor is supposed to bear date from the *eighteenth*. But if the reign of Ahab truly began in the *thirty-eighth* of Asa, and if the length of his reign was truly *twenty-two* years either current or complete, it is impossible that Ahab could have died, and Ahaziah have begun to reign, in the *seventeenth* of Jehoshaphat, though they might, as we have seen, in the *nineteenth*. That there are corruptions of numbers in the sacred text, which may occasionally be detected, is an indisputable fact; and one such has been already pointed out. Among these, none perhaps was, *a priori*, more likely to happen than the corruption of *seventeen* into *nineteen*. There is a case in point with regard to the first of Joash, king of Israel; which, 2 Kings xiii. 10, is supposed to bear date from the *thirty-seventh* of Joash, king of Judah, and yet will be shewn in its proper place to bear date in reality from his *thirty-ninth*. In the same way it is equally possible that the *seventeenth* of Jehoshaphat should be in reality the *nineteenth*; and by parity of consequence the *eighteenth* should be in reality the *twentieth*. For, as to this second corruption, it would be a necessary effect of the former. If the reign of Ahaziah was supposed to have begun in the *seventeenth* of Jehoshaphat, it would be supposed to have ended, and therefore the reign of Jehoram to have begun, in his *eighteenth*.

The method of solution, to which recourse is frequently had in cases of this description, that of supposing a son associated with his father before his death, is of no avail in the present instance. We can suppose neither that Ahab was associated with Omri

two years before *his* death, nor Ahaziah with Ahab two years before *his*; because the *last* year of Omri is the *first* year of Ahab, and both bear date in the *thirty-eighth* of Asa; and the *last* year of Ahab must be the *first* of Ahaziah, or Ahaziah could not have survived him at all. With regard, however, to this method of solution in general, it appears to me so very questionable that, without the most demonstrative evidence of its truth, I should think it ought never for a moment to be entertained. There is no proof that any one of the children of the monarchs, either of Judah or of Israel, was ever associated with them; or, if they were, that the historical notices of their reigns are dated from the time of such association, and not from the actual deaths of their predecessors. The cases of Jehoram and of Uzziah, both kings of Judah, are cases in point; for though the former was struck with a foul and incurable disease *two* years before his death, and the latter, for probably a much longer time towards the end of his reign, was a leper, and excluded by his situation from any actual share in the government; there is no mention of their sons' being associated with them, nor any proof that their reigns are not supposed to extend to the very day of their death. I lay it down, then, as a fundamental principle, that no king's reign bears date except from the demise of his predecessor; and, consequently, that the specified lengths of their reigns are in every instance the time for which they reigned alone.

But to proceed: I will now assume that the true beginning of the reign of Ahaziah was after the Nisan, and before the Tisri, B. C. 896. in the *nineteenth* of Jehoshaphat.

Hence, 19 of Jehosh. 1 of Ahaziah. Nisan B. C. 896—895.

20 2 895—894.

Now Ahaziah died *in* his *second* year, after the Nisan, and possibly after the Tisri, B. C. 895. Hence, the first of Jehoram would truly bear date between Tisri, B. C. 895, and Nisan, B. C. 894, in the true *twentieth* of Jehoshaphat.

When, then, it is said ^k that Jehoram king of Israel reigned in the *second* year of Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat king of Judah, it is manifest that there is some corruption of the text; for this assertion is inconsistent not only with what has just been established, but also with 2 Kings viii. 16; which tells us that Jehoram, the king of Judah, began to reign in the *fifth* of Jehoram, the king of Israel—and yet *this* Jehoram had begun to reign in the *second* of the *other*. Some commentators would explain this by supposing Jehoram associated with his father in his *seventeenth* year, Jehoram the king of Israel to have begun to reign in Jehoshaphat's eighteenth, and Jehoshaphat to have died in his twenty-second. But this is only to explain one difficulty by another; for Jehoshaphat's reign cannot be abridged to *twenty-two* years, instead of *twenty-five*, without abridging that of Jehoram to *three* years instead of *eight*: both which would be clearly repugnant to the direct assertions of the text. It is much more probable that 2 Kings i. 17. contains an interpolation, without which it originally stood thus: So he died, according to the word of the Lord which Elijah had spoken; and Jehoram reigned in his stead, because he had no son. Interpolations of this kind there are, as well as corruptions of numbers; the presence of which creates inconceivable difficulty, while their removal sets every thing to rights. There is one in 2 Kings viii. 16 itself, in the words, *Jehoshaphat being then king of Judah*, the palpable absurdity of which,

^k 2 Kings i. 17.

especially when taken in conjunction with 2 Kings i. 17. as that stands, is too glaring to be overlooked. There is another, as we shall see, 2 Kings xv. 30: and, perhaps, also ix. 29: though I do not know that there are any more with which we at least should now be concerned.

Again, 20 of Jehosh. 1 of Jehoram. Nisan B. C. 895—894.

25 6 890—889.

If Jehoshaphat died in his twenty-fifth year, after the Nisan, B. C. 890, it would be truly in the *fifth* of Jehoram: hence the first of Jehoram his son¹ would also truly begin in the same. Hence,

1 of Jehoram. 6 of Jehoram. Nisan B. C. 890—889.

8 13 883—882.

Jehoram died *in* his eighth year, after the Nisan, B. C. 883, which was truly *in* the *twelfth* of Jehoram: the reign of Ahaziah would, consequently, truly begin in the twelfth of Jehoram^m: and as to the statement which occurs ix. 29. since *this* is obviously at variance with *that*, we should be bound to prefer that which is more consistent with the context: and this is viii. 25. not ix. 29. But, indeed, it is no unreasonable conjecture that the whole verse is an interpolation.

Again, 1 of Ahaziah. 13 of Jehoram. Nisan B. C. 883—882.

The time of the death of Jehoram was the time of the death of Ahaziah; and the time of the death of Jehoram was when the Israelitish army either was besieging or was defending Ramoth-Gilead, and after there had been an engagement with the Syriansⁿ; from the wounds received in which Jehoram was not yet recovered at the time. I think these circumstances authorize the inference that the death of Jehoram happened in the latter half of the year, between Tisri, B.C.

¹ 2 Kings viii. 16, 17. ^m Ibid. viii. 25. ⁿ Ibid. viii. 28, 29. ix. 14, 15.
² Chron. xxii. 5, 6.

883, and Nisan, B. C. 882, which might be truly in his *twelfth* year^o, or only at the very beginning of his *thirteenth*. Between the close of the true *twelfth* of Jehoram, B. C. 883, and the commencement of his nominal *fourteenth*, Nisan B. C. 882, there might be a very short interval of time; during which neither Athaliah nor Jehu might be yet firmly seated, the former on the throne of Judah, the latter on that of Israel. A few weeks' or even a few months' interregnum in either case would be nothing extraordinary: for there was some interval between the wounding of Ahaziah and his death^p—and between the death of Jehoram and Jehu's beginning to reign in Samaria as such^q; from which time in particular the testimony of 2 Kings x. 30. authorizes us apparently to deduce the beginning of his reign. It is a possible case, then, that both the first of Athaliah and the first of Jehu might truly and nominally alike bear date from Nisan, B. C. 882.

Hence 1 of Athaliah. 1 of Jehu. Nisan B. C. 882—881.

7 7 876—875.

Now Athaliah^r was put to death at the end of her *sixth* year, and *in* the seventh from the beginning of the concealment of Joash, when he was *one* year old. Hence the first of Joash bears date from Nisan, B. C. 876; which was truly in the *seventh* of Jehu^s.

Hence 1 of Joash. 7 of Jehu. Nisan B. C. 876—875.

22 28 855—854.

And if Jehu died at the very end of his *twenty-eighth* year, the *first* of Jehoahaz would truly bear date from Nisan B. C. 854, in the *twenty-third* of Joash^t.

Hence 23 of Joash. 1 of Jehoahaz. Nisan B. C. 854—853.

39 17 838—837.

And if Jehoahaz died towards the beginning of his

^o 2 Kings iii. 1. ^p 2 Chron. xxii. 6—9. ^q 2 Kings x. 1. 12. 15. 17. 30. 35. 36. ^r Ibid. xi. 3. 4. 21. 2 Chron. xxii. 12. xxiii. 1. xxvi. 1. ^s 2 Kings xii. 1. ^t Ibid. xiii. 1.

seventeenth year, after or about the Nisan, B. C. 838, the *first* of his son Joash, king of Israel, might truly begin in the *thirty-ninth* of Joash king of Judah. It is not possible, however, that it could have begun in his *thirty-seventh*; so that the thirty-seventh of Joash (2 Kings xiii. 10.) is a manifest corruption for the thirty-ninth. Besides which, the *first* of Amaziah, who succeeded Joash, began in the *second* of Joash, king of Israel^u. The *second* of the king of Israel, therefore, must have begun in the *fortieth* of the king of Judah at least; and, consequently, his *first* in the *thirty-ninth*.

Hence 39 of Joash. 1 of Joash. Nisan B. C. 838—837.

40 2 837—836.

Now let Joash be supposed to have died at the very end of his fortieth year; the true *first* of Amaziah, and the true *third* of Joash, would thus synchronise almost throughout: or the reign of Amaziah would begin towards the end of the second of Joash.

Hence 1 of Amaziah. 3 of Joash. Nisan B. C. 836—835.

15 17 822—821.

Joash died at the very end of his actual *sixteenth*, or beginning of his nominal *seventeenth*, after or about the Nisan, B. C. 822: which would be truly in the *fifteenth* of Amaziah^v. Hence

15 of Amaziah. 1 of Jeroboam ii. Nisan B. C. 822—821.

29 15 808—807.

And if Amaziah died at the end of his actual *twenty-ninth* year, about Nisan, B. C. 807, the *first* of Uzziah his successor would truly bear date from Nisan, B. C. 807, and truly in the *fifteenth* of Jeroboam.

Now Jeremiah lii. 31. compared with 2 Kings xxv. 27. is a proof that the numeral statement for *fifteen* might possibly be corrupted into that for *seventeen*;

^u 2 Kings xiv. 1.

^v Ibid. xiv. 23. 17. 2. 2 Chron. xxv. 25. 1.

in which case, the depravation of *seventeen* into *twenty-seven* would probably be even an easier effect. I conclude, then, that, 2 Kings xv. 1, the *twenty-seventh* of Jeroboam is a corruption of the *text* for the *fifteenth*, in which the *first* of Uzziah truly began.

There is no means of avoiding this inference, except by supposing an interregnum between the death of Amaziah in the *fifteenth* of Jeroboam, and the accession of Uzziah in his *twenty-seventh*; a supposition, which some commentators have accordingly made; but for which there appears to me so little reason, that I consider the other assumption (that of an error in the text, by which *twenty-seven* has come to be exhibited instead of *fifteen*) on every account to be preferred. The supposition of an interregnum in the duration of the kingdom of Judah, or in the regular succession of one king to another, and that for a period of *twelve* years, is most improbable and inconceivable: nor can any thing be clearer than it is from 2 Kings xiv. 21, 22. xv. 2. 2 Chron. xxvi. 1, 2, 3, that Uzziah was made king at *sixteen* years old, immediately on the death of his father. Hence the statement of his reign will be as follows.

1 of Uzziah. 16 of Jeroboam. Nisan B. C. 807—806.

26..... 41 782—781.

Now the *first* of Zachariah is supposed to have begun in the *thirty-eighth* of Uzziah^w: and this might be the case if, after the death of Jeroboam, about the end of his forty-first year, the Nisan, B. C. 781, there was an interregnum in the kingdom of Israel, until the latter half of the thirty-eighth of Uzziah, some time between Tisri, B. C. 770, and Nisan, B. C. 769: an interregnum, consequently, of almost twelve years in duration.

^w 2 Kings xv. 8.

On this principle the six months of Zachariah would begin some time before Nisan, B. C. 769: which would be truly *in* the thirty-eighth of Uzziah; but they might not expire until some time after Nisan, B. C. 769: which would be in his thirty-ninth. It is possible, then, that the one month of Shallum, and the first of Menahem*, might the one expire, or the other begin, at the very end of the thirty-ninth of Uzziah, about Nisan, B. C. 768*. Hence

40 of Uzziah. 1 of Menahem. Nisan B. C. 768—767.

49..... 10.....759—758.

And if Menahem died at the very end of his *tenth* year, Pekahiah would truly succeed, Nisan, B. C. 758, *in* the *fiftieth* of Uzziah^y. Hence

50 of Uzziah. 1 of Pekahiah. Nisan B. C. 758—757.

51..... 2.....757—756.

And if Pekahiah was killed at the end of his second year, the *first* of Pekah would truly bear date about Nisan, B. C. 756, *in* the *fifty-second* of Uzziah^z. Hence

52 of Uzziah. 1 of Pekah. Nisan B. C. 756—755.

whence if Uzziah died at the end of his fifty-second year, the *first* of Jotham would bear date about Nisan, B. C. 755, *in* the true *second* of Pekah^a.

Hence 1 of Jotham. 2 of Pekah. Nisan B. C. 755—754.

16.....17.....740—739.

And if Jotham died at the close of his sixteenth year, the *first* of Ahaz might still bear date *in* the true *seventeenth* of Pekah^b, about Nisan, B. C. 739.

Hence 1 of Ahaz. 18 of Pekah. Nisan B. C. 739—738.

320737—736.

* The conjecture, here advanced, implies, at the utmost, an interregnum of one or two months only, towards the end of B. C. 769 or beginning of B. C. 768.

^x 2 Kings xv. 13. 17. ^y Ibid. xv. 23 ^z Ibid. xv. 27. ^a Ibid. xv. 32.
^b Ibid. xvi. 1.

If Pekah, then, reigned *twenty* years^c, he must have been assassinated in the *third* of Ahaz. What, then, shall we say to the *prima facie* evidence of xv. 30? And Hoshea the son of Elah made a conspiracy against Pekah the son of Remaliah, and smote him, and slew him, and reigned in his stead, *in the twentieth year of Jotham the son of Uzziah*. My answer is, that the last words of this text are an interpolation; the fact of which is proved by the very necessity of the case.

For first, it is the direct conclusion from them that the death of Pekah, and the beginning of the reign of Hoshea, both coincided with the *twentieth* of Jotham; and that would be *recta fronte* at variance with 2 Kings xvii. 1.

Secondly, it is not possible to explain the difficulty by supposing that Jotham might have reigned *four* years in conjunction with Uzziah, before his death. For on this principle the *twentieth* of Jotham, as dated from that ἀρχή, must have been the *sixteenth* of Jotham, as dated from his father's death; and the twentieth of Pekah must have synchronised with the *sixteenth* of Jotham, and not with the *third* of Ahaz.

Thirdly, it may be assumed as an indisputable truth, that no one but Ahaz was king of Judah when Pekah conspired with Rezin to invade Judæa^d: the object of which invasion, as we learn from Isaiah vii. 6, was to dethrone Ahaz, and to substitute an usurper in his stead. Nothing, then, is more probable than that this invasion took place in the very *first* year of Ahaz; and that the recent death of Jotham was the cause of the invasion itself. For Jotham was a good king and a prosperous^e; which renders it exceedingly improbable that the Divine Providence would suffer him to be exposed to any such danger in his lifetime; and much

^c 2 Kings xv. 27.

^d Ibid. xvi. 5. 2 Chron. xxviii. 1—15.

^e Ibid. xxvii.

less to experience the signal defeat which happened to Ahaz. Yet it must be evident from 2 Kings xv. 37. that the designs against the kingdom of Judah began to be formed and acted upon almost *in* his lifetime, and certainly immediately after his death.

These conclusions are placed beyond a question by the testimony of Isaiah vii. 1–16. and viii. 1–4. which relate to the invasion and its consequences. The birth of Maher-shalal-hash-baz took place after this invasion^f, yet one or two years at least^g before the reduction of Samaria and Damascus, as accomplished by Tiglath-pileser^h. The death of Pekah was subsequent to all these events, and yet in his *twentieth* year: I would arrange them, then, as follows:

1 of Ahaz.	18 of Pekah.	<i>ineuntibus</i>	B. C. 739.	Invasion of Judæa.
1	18	<i>exeuntibus</i> 738.	{ Birth of Maher-shal-hash-baz.
3	20	<i>ineuntibus</i> 737.	{ Reduction of Samaria and Damascus.
3	20	<i>exeuntibus</i> 736.	Death of Pekah.

If, now, Pekah had been put to death at the very end of his *twentieth* year, the reign of Hoshea would properly have borne date from the *end* of the *third*, or the *beginning* of the *fourth*, of Ahaz. But it appears from 2 Kings xviii. 1. that the *first* of Hezekiah began in the *third* of Hoshea; yet from xviii. 9, 10, that his *fourth* began in the *seventh*, and his *sixth* in the *ninth*. It is manifest, then, that the *first* of Hezekiah did strictly begin in the *fourth* of Hoshea; and, consequently, that the *first* of Hosheaⁱ must strictly have begun in the *thirteenth* of Ahaz; the *beginning* of *which* might yet be considered the *end* of his *twelfth*. We may assume, then, that the *first* of Hoshea and the *thirteenth* of Ahaz synchronised, perhaps, throughout. Between the death of Pekah at the *end* of the *third* of Ahaz—and the accession of Hoshea at the *beginning* of his *thirteenth*, there was consequently a

^f Isaiah viii. 3. ^g Ibid. viii. 4. ^h 2 Kings xvi. 7—9. xv. 29. ⁱ Ibid. xvii. 1.

second interregnum in the kingdom of Israel of *nine* years in duration. To proceed then*.

13 of Ahaz. 1 of Hoshea. Nisan B. C. 727—726.

16 4 724—723.

If Ahaz died about the *middle* of his sixteenth year, between the Nisan and the Tisri, B. C. 724, the *first* of Hezekiah would truly bear date from the same time, and in the *fourth* of Hoshea.

Hence 1 of Hezekiah. 4 of Hoshea. Nisan B. C. 724—723.

4..... 7..... 721—720.

6..... 9..... 719—718.

And if Samaria was actually reduced at any period between Tisri, B. C. 719, and Nisan, B. C. 718, it would truly be reduced in the *sixth* of Hezekiah and in the *ninth* of Hoshea, both.

With regard to the residue of the reign of Hezekiah, his nominal fourteenth would begin Nisan, B. C. 711: his true, Tisri, B. C. 711: and the former would expire Nisan, B. C. 710: the latter Tisri, B. C. 710. In the latter half of his true fourteenth year, between Nisan and Tisri, B. C. 710. Sennacherib came up against him; and a little before the usual period of seed-time, that is, a little before Tisri, in the same year, as the very words of Isaiah distinctly imply^k, he was miraculously delivered from him.

The nominal *fifteenth* of his reign would begin and expire with the Nisan, the true with the Tisri, B. C.

* Syncellus i. 381. l. 17—382. l. 14. informs us that all copies of the books of Kings which he had been able to see, stated the reign of Pekah, son of Remaliah, either at eighteen or at twenty years, except *one*, which he says was written with great care and exactness, after originals corrected by Basil of Cæsarea himself; and there it was stated at twenty-eight: by the help of

which he was able to discover that the *first* of Hoshea did indeed coincide with the twelfth of Ahaz. But the reading in this instance must have been produced either by not perceiving the fact of an interregnum between Pekah and Hoshea, or a desire to do away with it, and to add the years of that interregnum to the reign of the preceding king.

^k 2 Kings xix. 29. Isaiah xxxvii. 30.

710 and 709, respectively. We have supposed that his sickness attacked him immediately after his deliverance from Sennacherib¹; and, consequently, in the first half of his *true* fifteenth year; which bore date between Tisri, B. C. 710. and Nisan, B. C. 709. Hence the fifteen years added to his life^m bore date also between Tisri, B. C. 710, and Nisan, B. C. 709: and they were either current years, or complete; current, if Hezekiah reigned twenty-nine years incomplete, but complete, if he reigned twenty-nine years complete. But his reign is stated at twenty-nine years only—and his nominal *first* beginning Nisan, B. C. 724, his nominal *twenty-ninth* began Nisan, B. C. 696, and expired Nisan, B. C. 695. To this time from Tisri, B. C. 710, there would be *fourteen years and six months* complete; or *fifteen* current years in all.

We may pause here to point out a coincidence between Scriptural and profane chronology. The embassy of Merodach-baladan king of Babylon was produced partly by the news of Hezekiah's sickness and recovery, and partly by the sign, relating to the sun, which had been vouchsafed unto himⁿ. This embassy, therefore, it is morally certain would take place either in the *last* half of B. C. 710, or the *first* half of B. C. 709. Now the Merodach-baladan of Scripture is with great reason supposed to be the Mardoc-empadus of Ptolemy's canon; the beginning of whose reign, according to Dodwell's edition of that canon^o, fell out *Æræ Nabonassari* 27. B. C. 721, and the end *Æræ Nabonassari* 39. B. C. 709: and as all the years in that scientific canon begin with the first day of the same month, the Egyptian Thoth, which answered B. C. 721 to Feb. 20. and B. C. 709 to Feb. 17, it is manifestly possible that he might

¹ Supra, Appendix, Dissertation xi. 453. ^m 2 Kings xx. 6. Isaiah xxxviii. 5.
ⁿ 2 Kings xx. 1—12. 2 Chron. xxxii. 24. 31. Isaiah xxxviii. 7, 8. 22. xxxix. 1.
^o Dissertationes Cyprianicæ, Appendix, 84.

have sent this embassy to Hezekiah, between the Thoth, B. C. 710, and the Thoth, B. C. 709, though in the very last year of his reign.

Again, 1 of Manasseh. Nisan B. C. 695—694.

55 641—640.

From the great length of the reign of Manasseh, it is nothing improbable that he died *in* his *fifty-fifth* year, or B. C. 641.

Hence 1 of Amon. Nisan B. C. 641—640.

2 640—639.

The violent death of Amon, in like manner, authorizes the inference that the true length of his reign was not *two* years complete: and we may suppose the first of Josiah to bear date nominally from Nisan, but really from about Tisri, B. C. 640.

Hence 1 of Josiah. Nisan B. C. 640—639.

13 628—627.

18 623—622.

31..... 610—609.

The reign of Josiah certainly began before the *first* month in the sacred year^p; and it certainly terminated in spring; for it was at a time when Pharaoh-Necho was taking the field to begin a march from Egypt to the Euphrates^q. We may reasonably infer, then, that he died at the *end* of his *nominal*, but the *middle* of his *real*, *thirty-first*, about Nisan, B. C. 609. From an eclipse of the moon on the eleventh of March, B. C. 609, (vide the Table of Pingrè,) we may conclude that the first of Nisan would synchronise that year with the beginning of the month of April; before, or by which time the king of Egypt may well be supposed to have set out on his expedition.

The three months of Jehoahaz, whom Jeremiah de-

^p 2 Kings xxii. 3. xxiii. 23. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 8. xxxv. 1. 19.
xxiii. 29, 30. 2 Chron. xxxv. 20—24.

^q 2 Kings

signates by the name of Shallum^r, being dated from the Nisan, would expire with the Thamuz, B. C. 609 : at which time it is possible Necho might be on his return. The *first* year of Jehoiakim will consequently bear date nominally from Nisan, B. C. 609, but truly from Thamuz, B. C. 609. In support of this conclusion there are various presumptive proofs.

I. Jeremiah xxxvi. 1. we have mention of the *fourth* of Jehoiakim ; and, 9. 22. directly after, of the *fifth*, and of the *ninth* month. The whole subject-matter of the chapter is so connected as to lead to the inference that the command to write the roll was given to Jeremiah, at the very end of the *fourth* of Jehoiakim^s ; and consequently that the fourth of Jehoiakim did truly expire not long before the *ninth* month in the sacred year.

II. The reason of the thing must imply that Jeremiah xxxvi. is a later prophecy than Jeremiah xxv. Now Jeremiah i. 2. and xxv. 1. 3. from the *thirteenth* of Josiah, to this time in the *fourth* of Jehoiakim, there were *twenty-two* years, and part of a *twenty-third*. The thirteenth of Josiah began nominally with the Nisan, truly with the Tisri, B. C. 628. From Nisan, B. C. 628, the twenty-second year was complete Nisan, B. C. 606 : and from Tisri, B. C. 628, it was so in Tisri, B. C. 606. If Jeremiah follows the former date, the prophecy was delivered after *Nisan*, B. C. 606 ; if the latter, after *Tisri*, B. C. 606 : but in either case in the *fourth* of Jehoiakim ; from which it seems the most probable inference that the *fourth* of Jehoiakim began between *Nisan* and *Tisri*, B. C. 606 : and, consequently, his first between *Nisan* and *Tisri*, B. C. 609. Hence, as his predecessor reigned *three* months, to all appearance immediately before him, it seems

^r Jerem. xxii. 11.

^s Vide xxxvi. 1, 2, 6, 8, 9. xlv. i.

equally obvious that *his* reign ended and Jehoiakim's began at an equal distance from both those months *.

Hence 1 of Jehoiakim. Nisan B. C. 609—608.

3 607—606.

4 606—605.

5 605—604.

6 604—603.

11 599—598.

Now that Jehoiakim did not reign *eleven* years *complete* appears from this; that the *fourth* of Jehoiakim was the *first* of Nebuchadnezzar^t—and the three months, ten days, of Jehoiachin[†] came within the *eighth*^u. Now these synchronisms would hold good if the *first* of Nebuchadnezzar began about Nisan B. C. 606: (for that would be truly in the *third* of Jehoiakim *medio* or *exeunte*; and nine months or six of the *fourth* of Jehoiakim would still come within the *first* of Nebuchadnezzar:) and the death of Jehoiakim took place in the ninth or tenth month of the Jewish year, at the very end of B. C. 599: for then the last three months of the eighth of Nebuchadnezzar, or the first three months of B. C. 598, would be the three months of the reign of Jehoiachin. And this conclusion may be confirmed as follows:

I. There is a fitness in placing the death of Jehoiakim in the *ninth* month of the Jewish year, because it

* It is possible, indeed, that the death of Josiah, B. C. 609, might happen towards the end, rather than the beginning of the spring quarter, in that year. In this case the true date of the accession of Jehoahaz might be Thamuz, and that of Jehoiakim Tisri, in the same year. And this supposition will accord, on

the whole, much the best with the preceding statements.

† The statement at 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9. which makes Jehoiachin *eight* years old, when he began to reign, must be corrected by 2 Kings xxiv. 8. which makes him *eighteen*. See also 1 Esdras i. 43.

^t Jeremiah xxv. 1.

^u 2 Kings xxiv. 8. 12. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9.

was in that month^r that he committed the crime which drew down upon him the sentence, fulfilled in the manner of his death.

II. From 2 Kings xxv. 1, 2, 3, it is evident that the reign of Zedekiah began between the *tenth* and the *fourth* months in the Jewish year. Jeremiah xxviii. 1. also, allusion occurs to his *fourth* year and the *fifth* month, and xxviii. 17, to the *same* year and the *seventh* month.

III. The prophet Ezekiel was one of those who appear to have been carried into captivity along with Jehoiachin: the date, at least, which he invariably follows in all his predictions is the date of this captivity: vide i. 1, 2. viii. 1. xx. 1. xxiv. 1. xxvi. 1. xxix. 1. 17. xxx. 20. xxxi. 1. xxxii. 1. 17. xxxiii. 21. * xl. 1: in all

* With regard to the date exhibited in this verse, vide Dissertation xviii. vol. ii. page 140, 141.

If there is any exception to the rule in question, it is furnished apparently by the *first* verse of the *first* chapter itself: Now it came to pass in the *thirtieth* year, in the *fourth* month, in the *fifth* day of the month. If this verse labours under no corruption of the numbers, the next verse shews that the *thirtieth* year, and *fifth* month, synchronised with the *fifth* of Jehoiachin's captivity, and the same month: that is, with B.C. 594. and the month Ab in the sacred year. In order to synchronise with this time B.C. 594, the *thirtieth* year must be referred to some corresponding time B.C. 623. Now B.C. 623. was apparently the *eighteenth*

of Josiah; in which year (2 Kings xxii. 3. xxiii. 2, 3. 23. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 8. 29—33. xxxv. 19.) he renewed the Mosaic covenant, and celebrated the Passover, as there recorded. I say, *apparently*; for the *eighteenth* of Josiah did truly begin Tisri, B.C. 623, and expire Tisri, B.C. 622: which is too late for the ἀρχὴ of the *thirtieth* year in question. If that *thirtieth* year was just complete, Ab, B.C. 594, it must have begun, Ab, B.C. 624, which would be in the *sixteenth* of Josiah *exeunte*: if it was just begun, Ab, B.C. 594, it must have begun, Ab, B.C. 623, in the *seventeenth* of Josiah *exeunte*: but in no case can it bear date in the *eighteenth* of Josiah, except as referred to its nominal ἀρχὴ, Nisan, B.C. 623.

It may perhaps be so referred,

× Jeremiah xxxvi. 9. 22. 29, 30. xxii. 18, 19.

which instances while the years are referred to the date of Jehoiachin's captivity, the months are the months of the sacred year. On this account, it seems impossible to doubt that the *first* month of the sacred year, and the *first* month of the captivity, began and proceeded together*. If so, the last month of the sacred year synchronised with the last month of the reign of Jehoiachin; and Jehoiachin began to reign B. C. 598, *ineunte*, and was made captive in the third month of the same year, in the *eighth* of Nebuchadnezzar. The *first* year of Zedekiah and the *ninth* of Nebuchadnezzar would thus begin and proceed together, from Nisan, B. C. 598. Hence,

if the text is to be considered sound, according to the opinion of Usher; though I should rather understand it, even in that case, of the *age* of Ezekiel when he was called to the prophetic office. Jerome (*Operum* i. 647, 648. *Præfatio* in Ezek.) so refers it: though elsewhere, (iii. 699. *ad principium*, in Ezek. i.) he refers it to the *twelfth* of Josias, quando inventus est liber Deuteronomii in Templo Dei. But the occurrence of this date here is a manifest anomaly, compared with the rule which prevails every where else: and if there were any reason to doubt about the integrity of the text, then I should consider it by no means unlikely that the mention of the *thirtieth* year here arose out of the allusion to the *sixth* year, viii. 1. There might be some cause to conclude from viii. 4. x. 15. 20. 22. xi. 24, 25. that the vision, which begins to be recorded viii. 1, was directly consecutive upon that recorded i. 1. Hence had Ezekiel originally written, It came to pass in the *fourth* month, in the fifth day of the

month, without any mention of the year, some scribe might suppose it was the fourth month of the *sixth* year: and make a marginal annotation accordingly. If this once got into the text, its corruption into the *thirtieth* would be a still easier process. I propose this opinion, however, as a mere conjecture: but it is some confirmation of it that Ezekiel mentions another year, verse 2, which is also referred to the same date as every other note of time subsequently; and therefore it is not likely that he would mention a different one, and such an one as has nothing afterwards to resemble it, in the verse immediately before.

* This conclusion is further deducible from the testimony of 2 Chron. xxxvi. 10, "And when the year was expired," &c. understood, according to its most probable construction, of the sacred year. For hence it would follow demonstratively, that with the end of the reign of Jehoiachin, one sacred year expired, and with his captivity, another began.

1 of Zedekiah.	9. of Nebuchadnezzar.	Nisan B. C. 598—597.
10	18	589—588.
11	19	588—587.

Vide Jeremiah xxxii. 1. and lii. 12. But the temple and Jerusalem were destroyed in the *fifth* month of the sacred year, Ab, B. C. 588: and consequently, soon after the beginning of the *eleventh* of Zedekiah, and of the *nineteenth* of Nebuchadnezzar. The true date of the destruction of Jerusalem then was Ab, B. C. 588: and the *fourteenth* year from that destruction complete would be Ab, B. C. 574. The true date of Ezekiel's or Jehoiachin's captivity was Nisan, B. C. 598: and the *twenty-fifth* year from that date began, *in* the *fourteenth* from the other, Nisan, B. C. 574: which is the synchronism specified at Ezekiel xl. 1.

Having thus established the fact that the date of the destruction of Jerusalem was truly the fifth month in the sacred year, B. C. 588, I shall pause for the sake of the following observations.

The testimony of Jeremiah has rendered it certain that the *fourth* of Jehoiakim, which began Thamuz or Tisri, B. C. 606, began in the *first* of Nebuchadnezzar: and the captivity of Jehoiachin, Adar, B. C. 598, took place at the end of his *eighth*. On this principle the first of Nebuchadnezzar, according to Jeremiah, is dated from Nisan, B. C. 606, and began in the third of Jehoiakim *medio* or *exeunte*.

Now from the *third* of Jehoiakim it is that Daniel dates the commencement of his own captivity^s: that is, the invasion of Judæa by Nebuchadnezzar, which ended in Daniel's captivity, was made in the *third* of Jehoiakim. If Nebuchadnezzar went up against Jerusalem between Nisan and Thamuz or Tisri, B. C. 606, he would do this in the *third* of Jehoiakim; and if the

revelation, recorded Jeremiah xxv. was made in any part of the rest of the year, it would still be made in the *fourth* of Jehoiakim, and might be in the *first* of Nebuchadnezzar. On this point, then, the two testimonies are at harmony together; and the common date to which they refer being B. C. 606, then the fact that Daniel's captivity is dated from this time, and the concurrent declaration of Jeremiah xxv. 11, 12, compared also with 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21, demonstrate the true beginning of the seventy years' captivity to be the first of Nebuchadnezzar, B. C. 606. There were two other captivities besides this, Jehoiachin's or Ezekiel's, B. C. 598, and Zedekiah's, B. C. 588: the former in the eighth, the latter in the nineteenth, of the king of Babylon: besides three minor deportations, in the seventh, the eighteenth, and the twenty-third, which are summarily alluded to, Jeremiah lii. 28, 29, 30. But that captivity, which would naturally be made the commencement of the whole term of years assigned to its duration, would be the first; and the time of this being B. C. 606, the seventy years in question begin and proceed with B. C. 606. And this is the only date which will accord to the fulfilment of prophecy; every allusion of which to the duration of the captivity fixes it at *seventy* years^t; and authorizes us to expect that it would be seventy years complete: which was actually the case if it began B. C. 606, and expired B. C. 536: but not upon any other supposition.

If, now, the *first* year of Daniel's captivity began in the *third* of Jehoiakim *medio* or *exeunte*, B. C. 606, the *fourth* year of his captivity began in the *sixth* of Jehoiakim *medio* or *exeunte*, B. C. 603. And this *fourth* year of Daniel's captivity, as it is strongly implied by Daniel i. 5. 18. ii. 1. either preceded, or at

^t 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21. Jeremiah xxix. 10. Daniel ix. 2.

least coincided with the *second* of Nebuchadnezzar. If so, the *first* year of Nebuchadnezzar coincided with the *third* of the captivity of Daniel, and both with B. C. 604. How then shall we reconcile this conclusion to the testimony of Jeremiah, that the reign of Nebuchadnezzar began in B. C. 606? The two statements are not inconsistent; as may thus be proved.

I. There is just two years' difference between them: and two years is the difference between the length of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, as it may be collected from Scripture, and as it is stated by Berosus, by the canon of Ptolemy, and by other ancient authorities. For first, the siege of Tyre being just over in the twenty-seventh year of the captivity^u, and the reduction of Egypt being yet to come; we cannot place that reduction earlier than this very year, the twenty-seventh of the captivity itself. Now the *twenty-seventh* of the captivity answers to the *thirty-fifth* of Nebuchadnezzar. Again, the return to Babylon, and the year's interval between that return and the commencement of Nebuchadnezzar's seven years' madness^v, must have occupied at least to the end of his thirty-sixth. The first of his seven years of madness would consequently not be earlier than his thirty-seventh; nor the last than his forty-third: after which, as it may be concluded from Dan. iv. 34—37. there could not be less than one or two years more to his death. On this principle the whole length of his reign would be forty-four or forty-five years at least; which the abovementioned authorities however state only at forty-three*.

* The length of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar was actually stated at forty-five years by an ancient author, referred to, Sulpicii Severi Sacrae Historiæ, ii. 7. It is there observed of Nebuchadnezzar; Hic post devictum, ut supra diximus, Sede-

^u Ezek. xxix. 17, 18.

^v Daniel iv. 1—16. 23. 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32.

II. It is presumptively to be inferred from Berosus^w that, when Nebuchadnezzar was placed at the head of his father's armies, he was also associated with him in the empire; and this might manifestly be about the time when he invaded Judæa, and took Circesium from Pharaoh-Necho, both in the fourth of Jehoiachim^x, B. C. 606. The same authority shews that this appointment was not long before his father's death.

III. A writer like Jeremiah, composing in Judæa, would naturally date the reign of Nebuchadnezzar from this time, if it was then that he first became connected with the affairs of Judæa; while an historian like Daniel, writing at Babylon, equally naturally would date it from no other time but that of his father's death.

IV. The canon of Ptolemy confirms the date of Daniel; and the duration of the captivity confirms that of Jeremiah. The first year of the captivity was the first of Nebuchadnezzar, and the year of the return was the first of Cyrus. From the first of Cyrus,

am, quem captivum Babylonem transtulit, regnasse traditur annos vi. et xx. quanquam id non in Sacra historia scriptum invenim. sed forte accidit, ut dum multa evolverem, annotationem hanc jam interpolato per ætatem libello, sine authoris nomine, reperirem, in quo regum Babyloniorum tempora continebantur, quam prætereundam non putavi. siquidem et Chronicis consentiret, et ita illius nobis ratio quadraret, ut per ordinem regum, quorum tempora continebat, usque in primum Cyri regis annum, LXX. annos (tot enim per Sacram historiam, a captivitate usque ad Cyrum fu-

isse referuntur) impleret. If we add to these twenty-six years of Nebuchadnezzar, after the capture of Zedekiah, the eighteen which he had reigned before it, 2 Kings xxv. 8, the sum total is forty-five current, if not complete, for the whole length of his reign. What the authority was, in which Sulpicius found this statement, further than that it was probably an ancient chronicle, does not appear. Megasthenes is said to have asserted the same thing; though I do not find the passage in his extant fragments, as preserved by Eusebius, Syncellus, or others.

^w Josephus Ant. x. xi. i. Contra Apionem i. 19, 20. Syncellus, i. 416. l. 9—417. l. 10. ^x Jeremiah xlv. 2.

B. C. 536, to the first of Nebuchadnezzar, B. C. 606, there was just the necessary interval of seventy years complete ; but from the same time to B. C. 604, there was not more than one of sixty-eight.

V. According to the canon, the reign of Evil-merodach, who succeeded to Nebuchadnezzar, began B. C. 561. According to Jeremiah, lii. 31. and 2 Kings xxv. 27, it began in the *thirty-seventh* year of the captivity of Jeconiah. The *thirty-seventh* year of the captivity of Jeconiah was consequently the last year of Nebuchadnezzar ; and that it would be, if the *first* of the former was the *ninth* of the latter, and he reigned *forty-five* years in all. Now the first year of the captivity beginning Nisan, B. C. 598, the *thirty-seventh* year expired Adar, B. C. 561. It was in *this* month, and on the *twenty-fifth* or the *twenty-seventh* day of the month, that Jeconiah was released from prison ; and consequently, it was in this month, or before it, that Evil-merodach ascended the throne *. A reign of forty-five years beginning B. C. 606, is exactly tantamount to a reign of forty-three beginning B. C. 604 ; for then they both terminate at the same time B. C. 561.

VI. According to the book of Kings, and of Jeremiah, to the canon of Ptolemy, and to Berossus, and to other

* The testimony of the canon of Ptolemy accords to this supposition: the *first* *Thoth* of Evil-merodach, according to this canon, fell upon January 11: which implies that the *true* beginning of his reign might be *after* that date, but could not be *before* it. Now it may be proved from Pingrè that the first of Adar, B. C. 561, would not fall earlier than the beginning of February: nor consequently the

25th or 27th earlier than the end: at which time Evil-merodach might be just come to the throne.

In like manner, the first *Thoth* of Nebuchadnezzar, B. C. 604, fell upon January 21: so that his reign, according to the canon, began after that day at least: which agrees exactly to our conclusion respecting its true beginning; viz. Nisan in the sacred year.

ancient authorities^y, the successor of Nebuchadnezzar was Evil-merodach; according to the book of Daniel, it was apparently Belshazzar. The difference of name constitutes no difficulty; and each of these statements is consistent with the other, if Belshazzar was the same with Evil-merodach: and this I believe to be the case.

For first, it is predicted, Jeremiah xxvii. 7. (2 Chron. xxxvi. 20.) that All nations should serve Nebuchadnezzar, and his *son* and his *son's son*, that is, his *grandson**. But it is not predicted they should serve any more of his family. Now Nebuchadnezzar had no children of whom we read, except his son Evil-merodach, and a daughter married to Neriglissar. The fruit of this marriage was a son, called Laborosoarchod, and consequently *a grandson* of Nebuchadnezzar. All these were kings after Nebuchadnezzar in their turns; first Evil-merodach, then Neriglissar, and lastly, Laborosoarchod. But Nabonadius, the successor of Laborosoarchod, as it is implied by Berosus and expressly mentioned by

* There are commentators who apply Isaiah xiv. 29. to the same three persons; but in my opinion very improperly: since it is much more probable that the *serpent's root* denotes Tiglath-pileser; the *cockatrice*, Shalmaneser; and the *fiery-flying serpent*, Sennacherib: all of whom, from the time denoted by 2 Kings xv. 29. in the twentieth of Pekah, B. C. 737, to the defeat of Sennacherib, B. C. 710, that is, for a period of twenty-seven years, were successively scourges of *Palestina*, and the neighbouring regions. The date of this prophecy was B. C. 725, or 724, the year of the death of

Ahaz. If Tiglath-pileser died about this time, the first of Shalmaneser might bear date from the same: and that Shalmaneser was the *son* of Tiglath-pileser is just as probable as, from the testimony of Tobit, i. 15, that Sennacherib was the *son* of Shalmaneser is certain. Nothing more is recorded of Shalmaneser, except that after his conquest of Samaria he besieged Tyre for five years, though he did not reduce it.—Ant. Jud. ix. xiv. 2. There may be proof then, that he was reigning so late as B. C. 713, but no proof that he was reigning later.

^y Megasthenes, Alexander Polyhistor, and Abydenus, apud Syncellum, i. 427. l. 4. et seqq. Eusebius, Evangelica Præparatio, ix. cap. 39, 40, 41. Chronicon Armeno-Latinum, Pars i. a. 44, 45. 53—60. Cf. Josephus, Ant. x. xi. 2.

Megasthenes or Abydenus^z, was no relation of Nebuchadnezzar's whatever. We may take it for granted then, that Belshazzar was one of the former; either Evil-merodach, Neriglissar, or Laborosoarchod: but that he was not Nabonadius.

Secondly, according to Berosus, the reign of Laborosoarchod was a reign of only nine months; and Berosus is confirmed by the canon, which omits this reign altogether because it was less than a year. This is sufficient to prove that Belshazzar was not Laborosoarchod: for the reign of Belshazzar extended into his third year at least^a.

Thirdly, according to Berosus, and our other authorities, Evil-merodach himself was assassinated by Neriglissar—but Neriglissar, so far as appears to the contrary, died a natural death. Now, Dan. v. 30, Belshazzar also was certainly assassinated: whence he might be Evil-merodach, but he could not be Neriglissar.

Besides which, Dan. v. 2. 11. 13. 18. 22, Belshazzar is *so* called the *son* of Nebuchadnezzar, as seems to leave no doubt that he was truly and properly such: and this also is true of Evil-merodach, but neither of Laborosoarchod nor of Neriglissar.

The Book of Baruch, which some commentators consider authentic, and which, even if apocryphal, is nevertheless of great antiquity; speaks of Balthasar, or Belshazzar, as standing in no other relation; and as born before the *fifth* of Jehoiachin's captivity itself: a supposition which we shall see hereafter is by no means improbable. ch. i. 2. 11, 12.

The captivity of the Jews was still a recent event at the very time of his death^b: which also might be true of Evil-merodach.

The reign of Evil-merodach, according to the canon

^z Eusebius, *Præparatio Evangelica*, ix. cap. 41. 457. B. *Chronicon Armeno-Latinum*, Pars i. 60. ^a Dan. vii. 1. viii. 1. ^b v. 13.

of Ptolemy, must have lasted for *two* years complete, at least; and it has been seen from Dan. vii. 1. viii. 1. that the reign of Belshazzar extended *into* his *third* year; but there is no proof that it extended beyond it.

The death of Belshazzar took place in the very midst of a festive celebrity: and that is just such a death as might be the natural effect of a conspiracy against his life, formed and executed by a confidential person, like Neriglissar, his sister's husband.

These reasons appear to me almost demonstrative that Belshazzar was really Evil-merodach: between whose death, and the capture of Babylon by the Medes and Persians, there were consequently three intermediate reigns, Neriglissar's, Laborosoarchod's, and Nabonadius's. What, then, shall we say to the testimony of Daniel, v. 30, 31, which tells us that Darius the Mede took the kingdom, in the very next verse to that which mentions the death of Belshazzar? My answer is, though it is a truth which has been overlooked by chronologers and commentators, that Dan. v. 30, 31, affirms no connection between the death of Belshazzar and the accession of Darius—that they were not of necessity consecutive events—and that it may be proved from Daniel himself, that there was in reality a *twenty-one years'* interval between them.

I ground this assertion on Daniel x. 13: But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me *one* and *twenty* days. It seems to me clear from xi. 1. ix. 1, that these *twenty-one* days of opposition expired in the *first* of Darius: and from ix. 21. viii. 1, 2. 16, 17, that they began in the *third* of Belshazzar: and that they are figuratively intended for the interval which, notwithstanding the death of Belshazzar^c in the *third* year of his reign, and the declaration^d, that his king-

^c v. 30.

^d v. 28.

dom was divided and given to the Medes and Persians, which immediately preceded his death, was yet to be interposed before the accession of the first Medo-Persian monarch.

There can be no question that the word of prophecy had coupled the deliverance of the Jews with the dissolution of the Babylonian monarchy, and the commencement of the Medo-Persian: and this connection is very plainly implied by Daniel ix. 1, 2. It is equally indisputable that, in resentment of the profane impiety of Belshazzar, evinced at his feast, this dissolution was predicted on the very night of his death. The very night of his death then seemed to be fixed as the point of time whence the deliverance of the Jews was to begin. But there was to be in reality a certain intermediate interval; which, being so far a delay of the downfall of the Babylonian monarchy, was so far a delay of the promised deliverance of the Jews. This delay is ascribed to the opposition of a Power adverse to the counsels of God, and interested in opposing the liberation of the Jews: which Power is called the Prince of the kingdom of Persia. This Prince of the kingdom of Persia is clearly described as a real being and a personal agent, who must consequently be capable of a real agency and a personal part of some kind or other; and whatever opinion we may form of the nature of the agent himself, the part ascribed to him is plainly implied to be adverse to the counsels of God for the good of his people in particular. The Prince of Grecia is similarly alluded to at x. 20: and as Persia or Grecia is thus supposed to have its peculiar Prince, so are the Jews described as having theirs' in the person of Michael, x. 13. 21. xii. 1: and as the former are supposed to thwart or resist the dispensations of Providence in behalf of the Jews,

so is the latter supposed to promote or to favour them.

I know not what other meaning but this can be attached to the words in question. As to supposing that the twenty-one days relate to the interval between the commencement of the rebuilding of the temple, B.C. 535, and its completion even B. C. 515, this was an interval of *twenty* prophetic days only, not of *twenty-one*; and though it had been one of *twenty-one*, it would not have been an interval of opposition, for all that length of time, on the part of the Persians, but upon the whole, of assistance and encouragement. The progress of the work might be suspended during the reign of Cambyzes; but that could be only for seven or eight years in all: the remaining thirteen, instead of years of opposition, were years of protection and support.

On the other hand, it is a remarkable coincidence, and abundantly sufficient to confirm our interpretation of the text, that, according to the canon of Ptolemy, the united reigns of Nebuchadnezzar and Evil-merodach, forty-five years in all, beginning B. C. 604, expired B. C. 559: and the united reigns of Neriglissar and Nabonadius, exactly twenty-one years together, beginning B. C. 559, expired B. C. 538, in the very year which the canon ascribes to the *first* of Cyrus: but which is truly to be understood of the *first* of Darius. For the canon ascribes *nine* years to Cyrus, dated from the close of the Babylonian dynasty; whereas the true length of his reign was *seven*: a difference easily accounted for, if Darius reigned *two* years independent of Cyrus, which are nevertheless reckoned into his reign *. The testimony of Daniel is implicitly in

* Eusebius (Chronicon Armeno-Latinum, Pars i. 44, 45) gives the lengths of these several reigns,

beginning with that of Nabopolassar, or as he calls him, Sardana-pallus, down to Cyrus, from Ale-

favour of this supposition; for he mentions nowhere any more than the *first* year of Darius; though he mentions the *first* and the *third* of Cyrus^e—and as Darius was sixty-two years old when he came to the throne, it is manifestly possible that he might die at the end of his *second* year; when he would be sixty-three or sixty-four*.

In support of the same interpretation we may further reason as follows :

I. The feast, at which Belshazzar was slain, was manifestly in the midst of peace^f. This might be the case B. C. 559, but could not B. C. 538. And though it may be true, as Herodotus attests^g, that the city was surprised by the Persians while some public celebrity was going on, (which was most probably the festival called *Sacea*; celebrated, according to Berossus^h and perhaps to Ctesias, for five days, from the sixteenth to the twentieth of the month Lous,) yet there is nothing in the whole of Jeremiah l. and li. though devoted almost exclusively to this topic of the capture of Babylon, which authorizes the inference that it would be taken under such circumstances as these of Belshazzar's feast.

II. The queen-mother, or wife of Nebuchadnezzar, was still living, and the *second* ruler in the kingdomⁱ. This also might be true, B. C. 559, only *two* years after the death of her husband; but it is highly im-

xander Polyhistor after Berossus—all agreeably to our statements; excepting that, relating to the reign of Evil-merodach, to which he assigns twelve years instead of three: and even this may be explained, if Evil-mero-

dach was regent, during his father's illness, *seven years*, became sole king *two years* after, and died in his *third* year.

* For some further observations on Daniel x. 13, see the next Dissertation.

^e ix. 1. xi. 1. i. 21. x. 1.
^h Athenæus, xiv. 44.

^f Dan. v. 1—4. 23. 30.
ⁱ Dan. v. 7. 10, 11. 16. 29.

^g i. 191.

probable, B. C. 538, as much as twenty-one years later.

III. If Darius succeeded directly to Belshazzar, whether B. C. 559 or B. C. 538, the Book of Daniel is placed in opposition to Berosus, Megasthenes, Abydenus, and others; who affirm that the reigning king, at the time of the conquest of Babylon, was not killed—but survived the contest, and was well treated by the Persians. All this might be true of Nabonadius; but Daniel affirms only the fate of Belshazzar. Jeremiah too, in the chapters referred to above, implicitly agrees with the historians in question: especially li. 31, 32: One post shall run to meet another, and one messenger to meet another, to shew the king of Babylon that his city is taken at *one* end, And that the passages are stopped, and the reeds they have burned with fire, and the men of war are affrighted. For while all this very plainly describes in what way the city would be taken, and is remarkably in unison with the event, yet it gives no reason whatever to suppose that the king of Babylon himself would be slain.

IV. The various accounts of the conquest in question, as given respectively by Herodotus, Berosus, Megasthenes, Abydenus, or Xenophon, however much they may differ from each other, will be all alike consistent with the Book of Daniel—whose testimony is committed in favour of none of them more than of another.

V. Daniel i. 1 and i. 21 laid together imply that, as the *third* of Jehoiakim was the true beginning, so the *first* of Cyrus was the true end of the captivity. For Daniel certainly survived until the *third* of Cyrus^k; not merely until the *first*: nor would it be said that he continued only to the *first* of Cyrus, if it had

^k x. i.

not been intended to imply thereby that he continued all *through* the captivity; he saw its *beginning* in the *third* of Jehoiakim, and he saw its *end* in the *first* of Cyrus. Besides, it is a just inference from ix. 1, 2. that the *seventy years* were ready to be accomplished, but not necessarily that they were accomplished, in the *first* of Darius: and vi. 10. further confirms the inference; for this also was most probably in the *first* of Darius.

VI. There is no proof at viii. 1, 2. that Daniel was not still in Babylon in the third of Belshazzar; for it was in vision only that he was then at Shushan. But x. 1. 4. in the *third* of Cyrus he was no longer at Babylon; but somewhere upon the Tigris.

VII. Though the Jews might have returned from captivity in the *first* of Cyrus, B. C. 536, and Daniel might be still alive in his *third*, B. C. 534, yet it is probable that he was then *ninety* years old: and this is a sufficient reason why *he* should not have accompanied them on their return; especially if *he* was in Persia, and *they* went up from Babylon—in the *first* of Cyrus.

VIII. Jeremiah xxvii. 7. already quoted, is no objection: for it does not necessarily imply that the Babylonian dynasty would expire upon the death of Nebuchadnezzar's grandson. The *very time of his land* might not be come *then*; nor was so in fact until the close of the reign of Nabonadius. Still less of an objection is it that the Book of Daniel itself gives no intimation of any interval between the death of Belshazzar, and the accession of Darius. *That* book is no *regular history*; but touches only *here* and *there* on contemporary events: and that too as more connected with the œconomy of the divine dispensations, than with the history of the reigning princes. The

story of Belshazzar is an isolated narrative; the sole end of which is to shew by what a remarkable interposition of penal Providence his impiety and profaneness were checked and resented at their very height. Nor does it appear that, after the *last* year of Belshazzar, any additional revelations were vouchsafed to Daniel before the *first* of Darius. The years of opposition to the counsels of God in behalf of the Jews, which began in the one and ended in the other, were years of intermission also in the communications made to the Prophet.

IX. If with Josephus¹, and the plurality of the modern interpreters of Scripture, we are at liberty to assume that Darius the Mede* in the Book of Daniel is the same person with Cyaxares in the Cyropædia of Xenophon, then the age of Darius, B.C. 538, is the age of Cyaxares. Daniel v. 31. describes this age as not quite sixty-two, but about it; the similarity of which description to St. Luke's of the age of our Lord at his baptism, as not quite, but about thirty, must be obvious. I infer then that the meaning of this description is the same with that of St. Luke's—viz. that Darius, B.C. 538, was not of the full age of sixty-two;

* It appears to me that Abydenus (apud Eusebium, *Chronicon Armeno-Lat.* i. 61.) recognises this Darius: for speaking of Nabonadius, the last king of Babylon, he says, Cui Cyrus, Babylonem capta, Carmaniæ principatum dedit: Darius rex de regione depulit aliquantulum. We can scarcely understand this allusion of Darius Hystaspis. It must be meant, therefore, of the Darius of Daniel. Jerome, *Operum* iii. 1091. *ad medium*, in

Dan v. observes, that not Xenophon only, but Pompeius Trogus, and, Multi alii qui barbaras scripsere historias, attested that Cyrus had an uncle by the mother's side, who, consequently, might be Darius the Mede. Polychronius, an ancient Christian commentator on Daniel viii. calls Darius, who with Cyrus reduced Babylon, Cyaxares: *Scriptorum Deperditorum Vaticana Collectio*, ii. 131. F.

¹ Ant. Jud. x. xi. 4.

but something less. The same thing therefore will hold good of Cyaxares: whose age, B. C. 538, being more than *sixty-one*, but less than *sixty-two*, complete, it follows, that the year of his birth was B. C. 600. It will considerably strengthen all our preceding conclusions, if it can be rendered probable that Cyaxares was actually born about that time.

Now, Daniel ix. 1. Darius the Mede is further described as the son of Ahasuerus; and if Darius was Cyaxares, Ahasuerus the father of Darius was Astyages the father of Cyaxares. The name of Ahasuerus, or Assuerus, occurs in the Book of Tobit^m; and the Book of Tobit, with respect to the facts of contemporary history, contains, in my opinion, so many proofs of its own authenticity, that I shall not hesitate to appeal to its testimony. The name of Ahasuerus is there coupled with the name of Nabuchodonosor, or Nebuchadnezzar; and both in conjunction are connected with the mention of the destruction of Nineve.

The time of the destruction of Nineve is presumptively to be determined by the age of Tobit. Tobit was fifty-eight years old, which we are at liberty to assume as equivalent to fifty-seven complete, when he was deprived of his sightⁿ: and he was deprived of his sight either in the last year of Sennacherib, or in the first year of Esarhaddon (Sarchedonus)^o. Both these years would coincide with B. C. 709: for the defeat of Sennacherib has been proved to have happened B. C. 710; and his death was ultimately the consequence of that defeat; being due to the cruelties which, upon his return home, he began to exercise partly on the Jews, in revenge for his defeat, and partly on his subjects generally. The Book of Tobit

^m xiv. 15.

ⁿ xiv. 2.

^o i. 21. 22. ii. 1—10.

supposes him to have died in less than two months after the time that the life of Tobit became endangered. The year of the death of Sennacherib may therefore be confidently assumed as either B.C. 710, *exeunte*, or B.C. 709, *ineunte*. The first year of Esarhaddon consequently began either B.C. 710, *exeunte*, or B.C. 709, *ineunte*; and it agrees with this conclusion, that Tobit, who returned home soon after his accession, returned before the Pentecost in that year^p. This could not be the Pentecost of B.C. 710; but it might be that of B.C. 709. On this day it was that he lost his sight^q.

Let us assume, then, that Tobit was fifty-seven complete before the Pentecost of B.C. 709: he would be one hundred and fifty-seven complete, or in current language one hundred and fifty-eight years old, before the same time, B.C. 609. It appears from the narrative that he both died himself and was buried in Nineve^r; and that Tobias departed thence into Media, only after each of those events. The siege of Nineve, then, was not yet begun when Tobit died and was buried, and when Tobias migrated to Media. But it might be begun as soon after these two things as we please: and if both had taken place before the Pentecost of B.C. 609, the siege of Nineve might be begun even in the same year; provided only it began after them.

Now according to Diodorus Siculus, who copied his accounts from Ctesias, the siege of Nineve lasted for two years, and part of a third^s. He tells us also that its capture was due to a great inundation of the river Euphrates, on whose banks it was situated, which threw down a considerable portion of its walls: and this inundation was the effect of long and continued rains. If that account be true, the time of the capture was the time

p i. 22. ii. 1.

q ii. 9, 10.

r xiv. 10, 11, 12.

s ii. 27.

of one of the rainy seasons—either the autumnal, or the vernal—and the latter is both as possible and as probable as the former. Hence if with most chronologers we assume that Nineve was taken and destroyed B.C. 606, it was taken and destroyed B.C. 606, in the spring quarter of the year: which if the siege had begun, B.C. 609, about midsummer, would be actually when two years, and nine or ten months of a third, were past.

Now B.C. 606, is the very year in which, according to the Book of Jeremiah, Nebuchadnezzar must have begun to reign; and only two years before B.C. 604, in which, according to Ptolemy, his father Nabopolassar must have died. The old king, before his death, had already given up to his son the command of his armies, and the care of all military operations; and the testimony of Scripture shews that Nebuchadnezzar was actually in possession of that authority as early as the *third* of Jehoiakim, B.C. 606. *ineunte*. There is not the least reason then to suppose that he did not command at the siege of Nineve; nor that Nabuchodonosor in the Book of Tobit is not the actual person who bore that name, and not Nabopolassar his father. It confirms these conclusions that B.C. 609, about spring or midsummer, was the time of the expedition of Pharaoh-Necho to the Euphrates; (for that expedition might be connected with the siege of Nineve, or intended to cooperate with the Assyrians against the Babylonians;) and that the fourth of Jehoiakim B.C. 606, after midsummer at least, was the time when Nebuchadnezzar defeated him, and took Circesium from him. The one of these events might be before or during the siege of Nineve—the other would necessarily be after it. It confirms them also that B.C. 606. is considered in some sense the *first* of Nebuchad-

nezzar: for he was probably associated in the empire in consequence of his success against Nineve. It is a similar argument that the same year was the *first* in which he appears to have had any thing to do with Judæa; for it is not to be supposed the Babylonian arms would have been carried as far as that country, so much more remote from home, before the reduction of Nineve.

On this principle, it was strictly Nebuchadnezzar, who was contemporary with Astyages or Ahasuerus; and they were both of them engaged at the same time on the siege of Nineve; the one in behalf of his father Nabopolassar, and the other, as we may presume, instead of his father Cyaxares. The first of these facts is not inconsistent with the testimony of Alexander Polyhistor^t; and the latter still less so with that of Herodotus^u; who makes Nineve to have been taken *in* the reign of Cyaxares it is true, but not necessarily *by* Cyaxares: and it is just as probable that, at the time of the reduction of Nineve, Cyaxares was an old man, and incapable of any longer active exertion in war, as that Nabopolassar was so.

The capture of Nineve, according to this historian, did not take place until after the expulsion of the Scythians; whose invasion of Asia, followed by twenty-eight years' ^v possession of it, occurred in the reign of Cyaxares. If the beginning of the Median dynasty is deduced from B. C. 710, at which time, in consequence of the severe blow to the Assyrian empire inflicted by the miraculous discomfiture of Sennacherib, the Medes are most reasonably supposed to have shaken off the yoke, the reign of Cyaxares, according to Herodotus^w,

^t Apud Syncellum, i. 396. l. 1. sqq. Cf. Eusebius, Chronicon Armeno-Lat. Pars i^a. 44. and Preparatio Evangelica, ix. 39. Ex Eupolemo: whence it appears, that Astyages, called there Astibares, was acting as the ally of Nebuchadnezzar, at a time which must have coincided with B. C. 606 or 598.

^u i. 106.

^v i. 106. iv. 1.

^w i. 102.

began *seventy-three* or *seventy-four* years afterwards, B. C. 637, or 636. The irruption of the Scythians then did not take place before B. C. 637, or 636. But the same irruption took place in the reign of Ardys, contemporary king of Lydia^w; and if we reckon backwards from the last year of Cræsus^x, B. C. 546, the reign of Ardys expired eighty-two or eighty-three years previously, B. C. 628, or 629. The irruption of the Scythians, then, could not have taken place later than B. C. 628: nor earlier than B. C. 637. But it took place when Cyaxares was besieging Nineve, in revenge for the death of his father Phraortes^{xx}; which renders it probable that it actually took place in B. C. 636. Hence, if B. C. 636. was the *first* year of their twenty-eight years' possession of Asia, B. C. 609. was the *last*. The siege of Nineve, then, though begun in B. C. 609, might still be begun after they had been dispossessed.

Now if the reign of Cyaxares began B. C. 637, B. C. 609. was his *twenty-ninth* year; and as he reigned only for eleven years longer, or forty years in all^y, it is not improbable that *he* was an old man, and already disqualified for military service, B. C. 609; but that Astyages was a young man, in the prime and vigour of his age. The same things are true of Nabopolassar and of Nebuchadnezzar respectively.

On this supposition Astyages and Nebuchadnezzar were not merely contemporaries, but in point of age very probably upon a par. A son of Astyages then would very probably be on a par with a son of Nebuchadnezzar; that is, the age of Cyaxares, at the time of the death of Nebuchadnezzar, might approximate to that of Evil-merodach. It confirms this presumption that they were *cousins*; for the queen of Nebuchad-

w Herodotus, i. 15.

x i. 86. 16. 25.

xx i. 103.

y i. 106.

nezzar, according to Alexander Polyhistor^z, was a daughter of Astyages, or rather of Cyaxares, called Amyhea*; and, according to Berosus^a, was certainly a Median princess. Now as Nebuchadnezzar reigned forty-three years, dated from B. C. 604; and as he was married to Amyhea, according to Polyhistor, even before his father's death, the age of Evilmerodach at the time of his accession, B. C. 561, was probably not less than forty. The same thing might be true of Cyaxares; who being about forty, B. C. 561, would be about sixty-two or sixty-three, B. C. 538. But his age may be still further limited.

Aryenis, the daughter of Alyattes, king of Lydia, was given in marriage to Astyages the son of Cyaxares^b, at the end of the war between those kings. This war could not have begun before B. C. 616, or 615, the *first* of Alyattes on the one hand, nor before B. C. 609, the year of the expulsion of the Scythians, on the other: nor, if the siege of Nineve was truly begun B. C. 609, before, perhaps, B. C. 606, when the siege was brought to a close. But it might have begun in B. C. 606, or B. C. 605: whence, as it lasted six years, its last would be B. C. 601, or B. C. 600. This last year is memorable as having been the year of the eclipse of Thales; and by turning to the Table of Pingrè, both B. C. 601, and B. C. 600. may be seen to be distinguished by remarkable eclipses of the sun; but especially B. C. 601, when

* The name of this princess, according to Eusebius, (*Chronicon Armeno-Latinum*, i. 44. 54.) on the authority both of Alexander Polyhistor, and of Abydenus, was Amyhea. Syncellus also (i. 396. l. 2.) calls her Amyïte, after Abydenus. All these authorities,

it is true, make her the daughter of Astyages, as well as the wife of Nebuchadnezzar; and they all suppose the siege or destruction of Nineveh to have coincided with the time of her marriage to him. But she was truly the sister of Astyages.

^z Apud Syncellum et Eusebium, *locis citatis*. ^a Syncellus, i. 418. l. 5. Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, i. 19. Cf. Diodorus Sic. ii. 10. ^b Herodotus, i. 74.

there was an eclipse on September 20. at nine in the morning, *central*, and *visible* all over Asia. It is very possible, then, that this was the eclipse predicted by Thales; and, consequently, that B. C. 601, was the close of the Medo-Lybian war, and the year when As-tyages was married to Aryenis. If Cyaxares was the offspring of this match, his birth might take place B. C. 600, either before or after the month of September in that year. On this principle, if Babylon was taken at the period of the *Sacea*, sometime in the month of June or July, B. C. 538, and Darius' reign at Babylon bore date from the time of that capture, his reign might begin a little before the occurrence of his sixty-second birthday; when he would be naturally said to be *about* sixty-two years old; as much more than sixty-one; but not quite sixty-two. Nor would this commencement of his reign be at variance with the canon of Ptolemy. The *first* Thoth of Darius, according to this canon, bears date January 5; that is, his reign began *on*, or *after*, January 5, but not *before* it. And this would be true though it began even six months later.

In like manner, Cræsus the son of Alyattes was thirty-five years old ^c, when he came to the throne of Lydia; whence, if we place the beginning of his reign B. C. 560, he was thirty-five years old B. C. 560, and born B. C. 595. On this supposition he was five years younger than Cyaxares; but not more. According to Dino, the Persian historian ^d, Cyrus also began to reign at forty—and died at seventy. Nor is this an improbable statement; for Xenophon likewise ^e makes him an old man at the time of his seventh and last return to Persia, which coincided with the seventh year of his reign, dated from the capture of Babylon—B. C.

^c Herodotus, i. 26. ^d Cicero, De Divinatione, i. 23. ^e Cyropædia, viii. 7. §. 1.

529, or 530. If Cyrus was seventy, B. C. 529, or 530, he was sixty-one or sixty-two, B. C. 538, and one year younger than Cyaxares, or of the same age with him. Now all this is possible—or rather it is even probable. I see no reason whatever why each of these persons, Evil-merodach, the son of Nebuchadnezzar, Cyaxares, the son of Astyages, Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, and Cræsus, the son of Alyattes, as they were all obviously contemporaries, and all began to reign, Evil-merodach in Babylon, Cyaxares in Media, Cyrus in Persia, and Cræsus in Lydia, almost at the same time, the earliest not before B. C. 562, and the latest not later than B. C. 559—should not have been strictly *ὁμήλικες*, or nearly of an equal age. Their history is blended together, at a time when they must have been arrived at an age of maturity, and either had, or might have, children arrived at the same age also; particularly that of Cræsus and Cyrus. With regard to the assumed date of the birth of the latter, it requires no other supposition than that Mandane, the mother of Cyrus, was married to Cambyses, about the same time when Astyages was married to Aryenis; in other words, that Astyages, when married to Aryenis, was old enough to have a daughter of a marriageable age. This age in the East is as early as fourteen or fifteen; and if Astyages was thirty years old at the siege of Nineve, B. C. 609, he might have a daughter fourteen or fifteen years old, B. C. 600, or 599. It does not appear to have been known to Herodotus that he had any male issue; or any other daughter but Mandane: and if I may advance a conjecture, I should be inclined to think she was his only child before his marriage to Aryenis; and that she was not espoused to Cambyses until after the birth of Cyaxares. On this principle, if Cyaxares was born B. C. 600, Cyrus might be born B. C. 599, but not

before; and if he was born then, he would be seventy, B. C. 529.

We might now conclude this review of the Chronology of the kingdoms of Judah or of Israel, from the first of Solomon to the destruction of the temple; but there is still so remarkable a text, Ezekiel iv. 5, 6, which appears to me to relate to this subject, that for the sake of considering it we will still dwell somewhat longer upon it.

For I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, according to the number of the days, *three hundred and ninety days*: so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah *forty days*. I have appointed thee each day for a year.

Three hundred and ninety days *plus* forty days amount, on the whole, to four hundred and thirty days: which we may take it for granted are consecutive; and, on the authority of the last words of the text, are four hundred and thirty consecutive years*. The question which we should have to consider will concern only their beginning or their ending: and either of these being determined, the other is determined also.

* It is to be observed, that the Hebrew and the Septuagint differed in the statement of the numbers in question. Origen, *Operum* iii. 414. A. B. *in loc.*: οὐκ ἀγνοοῦμεν δέ τινα τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἔχειν ρ' καὶ ν' ἡμέρας· καὶ ἄλλα ζ' καὶ ρ' (190) ἡμέρας, καὶ τὰ πλείονα δὲ ζ' καὶ ρ'. ἡμέρας. ἀλλ' ἐπισκεψάμενοι τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκδόσεις εὗρομεν τ' εἶναι καὶ ζ' (390) ἡμέρας. Cf. Hieronymus, iii. 48. *ad medium*, in Is. v: 173. *ad calcem*, 174. *ad principium*, in Is. xvii. Syncellus, i. 433. l. 11. and 21.

The difference affected only the numbers for Israel; in the number of years for Judah there was no disagreement. And with respect to the former, Jerome, iii. 721. *ad medium*, in Ezech. iv. distinctly testifies that the Hebrew, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and some copies of the ο' themselves, had the number 390, not that of 190 or 150. Theodorit, ii. 710-712, in Ezech. iv. 4, 5, 6. adopts the shorter number.

Now, from iv. 8, a little lower down, And, behold, I will lay bands upon thee, and thou shalt not turn thee from one side to another, till thou hast ended the days of thy siege—and also from v. 1–17, it seems to me a just inference that the precise point of time, where the four hundred and thirty years are supposed to end, is with the close of the siege of Jerusalem, B. C. 588: and consequently that the beginning, answerable thereto, was sometime B. C. 1018.

Now it may be presumptively shewn that B. C. 1018 was the year of the numbering of the people in the reign of David; a numbering, which 2 Sam. xxiv. 1. ascribes to the anger of God against Israel; and 1 Chron. xxi. 1. to the malice of Satan. These are sufficient indications of a time when the *whole nation* was implicated in *some sin*; of which also the very judgment, ultimately inflicted upon it, is a proof: and as this sin was something which concerned both Israel and Judah, it is a possible case that it might be marked out as the ἀρχή of a period, expressly designed to bear the *iniquity* of both, for a limited duration of time since their settlement in the land of promise, until their final punishment in the destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple. I say a *limited* duration; for four hundred and thirty years are but a comparatively small portion of 1520–588 or 932, the whole interval of time comprehended between the Eisodus, and the destruction in question. The iniquity, therefore, which was laid upon Ezekiel, and supposed to be contracted through a period merely of four hundred and thirty years, was not the *accumulated* iniquity of the house of Israel since they became a people, but *some portion* of it—which cannot be supposed to have begun until five hundred and two years afterwards. Both these criterions coincide in B. C. 1018: which, if it was the

year of the numbering of the people, was truly a year distinguished by some national defalcation, and so far a beginning of iniquity. The first year of Jeroboam, king of Israel, it is true, was similarly distinguished, and in an eminent degree; but this was by an iniquity which affected Israel exclusively, and not Judah. Besides, the true date of that iniquity was B. C. 974; from whence 390 years, the period allotted to the iniquity of *Israel*, would bring us to B. C. 584; and 430, the period allotted to the iniquity of Israel and of Judah both, would bring us to B. C. 544.

Now 2 Sam. xxiv. 13, whatever explanation may be given of the mention of *seven* years of famine, compared with 1 Chron. xxi. 12, which speaks of *three*, to begin in the year *after* the numbering, I will assume that the statements are consistent with each other; and will reason for the present from that of the Book of Chronicles, which is confirmed also by the version of the Seventy in the parallel passage of 2 Sam. xxiv. 13.

It was obviously in the power of David to have chosen these *three* years of famine, before either of the other alternatives: in which case it seems reasonable to suppose that it was intended by the Divine Providence he should live through them. If so, we may infer that the alternative in question was not proposed to him later than B. C. 1017, *three* years before the end of his reign. And the peculiar fitness with which it might be proposed to him *then* will appear from this consideration; that B. C. 1017 was the close of the *sixth* year of the sabbatic cycle; the harvest of which, unless judicially blasted and destroyed, (as at Haggai i. 9. ii. 16, 17,) should have been three times as plentiful as usual. For the *first* sabbatic year beginning with Tisri, B. C. 1507, the *seventy-first* began with Tisri B. C. 1017.

Now the numbering of the people was completed in nine months and twenty days^f; and the day after the return of Joab, David received the message of Gad^g: at which time, as appears from 1 Chron. xxi. 20, wheat-harvest was ready to begin. It may be concluded, therefore, that the numbering began in the *seventh* sacred month, after the Scenopogia, B. C. 1018, and terminated in the *third* or *fourth*, about the annual recurrence of the Pentecost, B. C. 1017, when wheat-harvest was ready to begin. The true year of the numbering was thus B. C. 1018*: and the chronology of the latter half of the reign of David, beginning with the birth of Solomon, will still further establish this conclusion.

Eupolemus, as quoted by Eusebius^h, supposes Solomon to have been twelve years old when he came to the throne[†]; and Josephus supposes him to have been fourteenⁱ. His true age, I believe, to have been seventeen; for he reigned only forty years—yet Rehoboam, who succeeded him, was forty-one years old at his death; and consequently was born at the latest in the first year of his father's reign: which is much more probable, if Solomon was then in his eighteenth year, than if he was in his fifteenth, or merely in his thir-

* As the temple itself was ultimately built on the site of the threshing floor of Araunah, where the plague was stayed, (2 Chron. iii. 1,) this fact also supplies some degree of corroboration to the truth of the construction put upon the text in Ezekiel.

† So likewise the interpolated Epistle of Ignatius ad Magnesianos, cap. iii: apud Patres

Apostolicos, 888. E: and Jerome, iii. 36. *ad medium*, in Isai. iii.: Et e contrario Salomon duodecim annorum erat quando suscepit imperium. Chrysostom also has the same statement, in Isai. iii.: Operum vi. 35. §. 3. D. and the Hypomnesticon of Joseph, lib. iv. cap. 74. p. 171. 176. Cf. Hieronymus, ii. 619. *ad calcem*. Epistolæ Criticæ.

^f 2 Sam. xxiv. 8. ^g Ibid. 11. ^h Præparatio Evangelica, ix. 30. 447. B. D.
ⁱ Ant. Jud. viii. vii. 8.

teenth. Besides, on this principle, he would be just in his twenty-first year, in the fourth year of his reign, when he began the building of the temple. And he might possibly defer it until then on purpose; for the age of twenty, not earlier, was the Levitical age of majority. I consider it therefore highly probable that Solomon was in his eighteenth year, B. C. 1014: and consequently was born B. C. 1031, in the twenty-fourth year of David.

The course of events, which ensued upon the birth of Solomon^k, and begin to be related 2 Sam. xiii. 1, might begin with the very year of his birth, B. C. 1031. The first of the number was the violation of Tamar^l—from which to the death of Amon there were two *full* years. This death took place at *shearing* time^m, that is, in the spring quarter of the year. Hence, the violation of Tamar was B. C. 1031, *a vere*, and the death of Amon, followed by the flight of Absalom to Geshur, was B. C. 1029, *a vere*.

The time of Absalom's exile at Geshur is stated at *three* yearsⁿ; but not at three years *full*. Hence, if it began B. C. 1029, *spring*, it might expire B. C. 1026, *ineunte*, not long before barley harvest: and he would have been *two* full years returned^o at the same time, B. C. 1024, when he set the field of Joab on fire. Moreover, B. C. 1024 *ineunte* was the last half of the *sixth* year of a sabbatic cycle: when there could not but be barley on the ground. For $1507 - 1024 = 483 = 69 \times 7$.

The note of time which follows next, xv. 7, 8, is grossly corrupted. But 2 Chron. xxii. 2, compared with 2 Kings viii. 26, is a case in point to prove how easily the number *two* might have been corrupted into

^k 2 Sam. xii. 24.
^o Ibid. xiv. 28—33.

^l Ibid. xiii. 1—22.

^m Ibid. 23—27.

ⁿ Ibid. 38.

the number *four*: for the age of Ahaziah, which is stated at forty-two in the former, is represented at twenty-two in the latter: and that only can possibly be the truth. We may infer then that in this passage of the Book of Samuel the true reading originally was *two* years, if referred to the time of Absalom's reconciliation with David, or *four*, if referred to the time of the return from Geshur: a construction which verse eighth appears to justify. In this case the course of events is brought down to B. C. 1022, *ineuntem*, as the year of the rebellion of Absalom.

From 2 Sam. xvi. 1, 2. xvii. 19. 28, 29. xix. it may be collected that the flight of David from Jerusalem, the defeat and death of Absalom, and the king's restoration, were all events of this same year, B. C. 1022, between the spring and the autumn.

The three years' famine, which is next mentioned ^p, might begin the year after the death of Absalom; and if it began, as it ended ^q, at barley harvest, it would begin B. C. 1021, *spring*, and expire B. C. 1018, *spring*. On this principle that famine would only just be over in the year of the numbering itself; nor could any harvest as yet have been reaped before the time of the Passover or Pentecost in the next. *Four* years of famine then must already have elapsed consecutively up to B. C. 1017, *medium*; and if *three* years more were still to ensue from the same time forward, there would be virtually *seven* years in all. And thus the statement in the book of Samuel (which has also the support of Josephus^r) admits of being reconciled with that in the Book of Chronicles.

A careful perusal of the whole of the reign of David will satisfy an impartial reader that there is not a single fact disclosed in it, which can be shewn to be

^p 2 Sam. xxi. 1.

^q Ibid. 9, 10.

^r Ant. Jud. vii. xiii. 2.

at variance with this distribution of the last seventeen years of its duration : nor would it be difficult to arrange these facts, from B. C. 1054, to B. C. 1031, in their proper chronological order. But it is not necessary that we should do it at present. We may observe only that, with respect to 2 Sam. xiv. 27. and xviii. 18. since the three oldest sons of David, Amnon, Chileab, and Absalom, were born in that order, and while he was reigning in Hebron, between B. C. 1055. *medio*, and B. C. 1047. *ineunte*^s, though Absalom had been born only B. C. 1053, he would still be *thirty-one* years old B. C. 1022, in the year of his death ; and might have had children born to him, who yet might then be dead. The context of 2 Sam. xiv. 27. seems to imply that they were all born before, or not after, B. C. 1024, when their father would be twenty-nine years old. Again, with respect to Mephibosheth, who was five years old at the time of the death of Jonathant, B. C. 1055. *medio* ; he would be twenty years old, B. C. 1040, and twenty-five, B. C. 1035 : and if he was then admitted to the table of David^u, he might well have a young son : and at the time of the rebellion of Absalom, when he was accused by Ziba of aspiring at the throne of Israel, he would be in all the maturity and vigour of his age.

I think we have now done sufficient to establish our original position, that the lengths of the reigns of the kings both of Judah and of Israel are referred to a *nominal* date, and the synchronisms of one reign with another to a *true* ; the former the first month in the sacred calendar, the latter the particular month in which they happened to begin. I think also we have done somewhat towards the confirmation of another assertion which we made, page 452, *supra* ; that from

^s 2 Sam. iii. 2. 5. v. 14—16.

^t Ibid. iv. 4.

^u Ibid. ix. 1—13.

the beginning of the reign of Solomon, to the commencement of the seventy years' captivity, the Bible chronology was safely to be trusted. I do not know, indeed, that this truth required any corroboration from our own investigations; but it is a source of satisfaction to find that our own conclusions, in a plurality of instances, have the support and concurrence of the eminent men to whom the arrangement of that chronology is due.

There are yet some interesting coincidences which might be pointed out with respect to the reigns of contemporary kings of Egypt, who begin to be alluded to from the last year of Josiah downwards. These are Pharaoh-Necho and Pharaoh-Hophra, the former the Nechos, and the latter the Apries, of profane history: and it would be easy to shew, from the beginnings and the ends of their reigns respectively, that they must have been reigning, as is implied, 2 Kings xxiii. 29. 2 Chron. xxxv. 20. Jerem. xlv. 30. xlv. 13—end. Ezek. xxx. 20—26. xxxi. 1, 2. xxxii. 1, 2. 17, 18. 31. between the last year of Josiah, B.C. 609. and Ezek. xxix. 1—17. B.C. 572, the beginning of the twenty-seventh year of Jehoiachin's captivity*.

* Among these coincidences, however, there is one in Isaiah^a, relating to Tyre, which I will notice, but in brief. The predicted desolation of that city, like the duration of the Jewish captivity, was to last exactly *seventy* years from some beginning or other; which, it seems to me the most reasonable supposition of all, is the date of its capture, or at least of its siege, by Nebuchadnezzar. It may be collected from Philo-

stratus^b, and from the Tyrian archives^c, that the siege of Tyre lasted *thirteen* years in all; and from Ezekiel xxix. 17, 18. that its last year was the *twenty-sixth* of Jehoiachin's captivity, B.C. 573, in the *thirty-fourth* of Nebuchadnezzar. The Tyrian archives, if they are rightly quoted by Josephus, confirm the same conclusion; for, from the close of the siege to the first of Cyrus, the interval which they specify is not

^a xxiii. 15, 17.

^b Apud Jos. Ant. Jud. x. xi. 1.

^c Contra Apionem, i. 21.

I shall conclude, however, with some remarks on another subject.

It is not distinctly asserted in the Old Testament that Saul reigned forty years; yet, I think, it is presumptively to be inferred from it. We may ground this inference on 2 Sam. ii. 10. which specifies the age of Ishbosheth as forty, when he began to reign; viz. in the

less than thirty-six years and three months. Thirty-six years before B. C. 536, would begin B. C. 572: and thirty-seven, B. C. 573. The siege had not yet begun, B. C. 588, in the *eleventh* year of the captivity^d, the *nineteenth* of Nebuchadnezzar; which is abundantly sufficient to disprove the assertion of Josephus^e, that it was begun as early as his *seventh*, B. C. 600.

If we supposed the seventy years in question to begin B. C. 573, or 572, they would terminate B. C. 503, or 502; one or two years before the Naxian war, followed in its consequences by the Ionian revolt^f. Now the history of that war, which was not decided, as I think, until B. C. 493, proves that the strength of the Persians by sea consisted in the Phœnician fleet^g; and therefore that Tyre by that time had recovered its maritime eminence. But at the time of the Scythian invasion, which the *Fasti Hellenici*^h place B. C. 508—507. Darius was obliged to depend exclusively upon the Ionian fleetⁱ: and the danger to which he had been reduced, in consequence of that depend-

ence, would be the strongest of reasons with a wise and politic prince like Darius, why he should immediately begin to raise and maintain a navy of his own. It is most probable, then, that if Tyre had not yet risen from her ruins, B. C. 508, or 507, but had so B. C. 493, that she actually emerged from them first, B. C. 505, exactly *seventy* years after B. C. 585, when the siege began.

In like manner the forty years' desolation of Egypt, or a part of it, Ezekiel xxix. 8—16, which could not have begun before B. C. 572, if it began at that time, would expire B. C. 532, in the fifth year of Cyrus, dated from the beginning of his reign at Babylon. It is in this year, or not much before it, that Xenophon, in the *Cyropædia*^k, places the reduction of Egypt by Cyrus, as consequent upon that of Babylon: and if the desolation in question began with the conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, it might expire with its conquest by Cyrus: whose restoration of the Egyptian captives would be as natural as his restoration of the Jewish.

^d Ezek. xxvi. 1, 2. 7.

^e Contra Apionem, i. 21.

^f Fasti Hellenici, B. C.

501.

^g Ibid. B. C. 494.

^h Ibid. Appendix, cap. 18.

ⁱ Herodotus, iv.

89.

^k viii. 6. §. 19—23.

sixth year of the reign of David at Hebron: and consequently, as thirty-five in the *first*—or the year of the death of Saul. It is a probable conjecture that, after the death of Jonathan, Abinadab, and Melchi-shua^v, Ishbosheth was the oldest surviving son of Saul; and the conjecture appears to be confirmed by 2 Sam. xxi. 8. which seems to imply that, after the death of Ishbosheth, 2 Sam. iv. 7. Saul had no sons left except Armoni and Mephibosheth, his children by Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah. It is an equally probable conjecture that these were all his sons by his queen as such, Ahinoam, the daughter of Ahimaaz^w; for Rizpah is described as his concubine merely: and this conjecture also is confirmed by 1 Chron. viii. 33. ix. 39. which mentions these *four*, as the sons of Saul, only.

If, then, it could be proved that Saul was not yet married when he was appointed king, the age of Ishbosheth at the time of his death would be a demonstrative proof that he could not have reigned less than *thirty-five* years at least. But Ishbosheth was not the oldest of the sons of Saul: Jonathan was certainly older than he; if not Melchishua or Abinadab: and if Ishbosheth was thirty-five years old at the time of his father's death, Jonathan could not be less than thirty-six or thirty-seven, and might be thirty-eight or thirty-nine. It is a strong corroboration of this conclusion, that 1 Chron. viii. 34. ix. 40, confirmed by 2 Sam. ix. 1—13, Jonathan had only *one* son; and this son^x was but *five* years old at the time of his father's death. Jonathan then had been at least five years married at the time of his death; but probably not much more. And if he was married at thirty, or not much later, this would accordingly be the case.

Now, from the whole of the narrative, beginning

^v 1 Sam. xxxi. 2. 6. 8. 12.

^w Ibid. xiv. 49; 50.

^x 2 Sam. iv. 4.

1 Sam. ix. 1, and ending 1 Sam. xii. 25, relating to the appointment of Saul, there can be but one conclusion; that Saul was a *young* man, in the literal sense of the word, and still unmarried, at the time when he was fixed upon as king. What then must be said to the testimony of 1 Sam. xiii. 1. 2, which speaks of Saul's having reigned *two* years, and of something consequently done in his *third*, when Jonathan his son was not only born, but from the nature of the exploit itself could not have been less than twenty years of age? How this text may be understood in reality will appear by and by; what the consequences would be of understanding it literally shall be stated at present.

I. If Jonathan was twenty years old in the third year of Saul; his father, who could not be less than twenty at the time of his birth, could not be much less than forty when he began to reign. But would a person of the age of forty be described and set forth as a young man, so repeatedly as is the case with Saul, at the time when he was appointed king?

II. If Saul was about forty when he began to reign, he was about eighty at the time of his death. Now he died in battle: and is it to be supposed that a man of eighty would still be able to go forth to battle as a matter of course*? The age of man had already been diminished to its ultimate standard of *seventy* years; and David himself, who is said to have died in a *good old age*, did not live beyond that term of years: yet to what

* The age of sixty was fixed by law at Athens, as the limit of military service. Hence Pollux, Onomasticon, lib. ii. cap. 2. §. 6. ὑπὲρ τὸν κατάλογον, ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐξήκοντα γεγονώς ἔτη. Among the Romans it was even earlier, at forty-two, forty-nine, or fifty: see Ma-

crobis, in Somnium Scipionis, i. 6. Aulus Gellius, x. 28. A senator's term of service at Rome, too, cannot be placed later than sixty-five: See Seneca, Controversiarum i. viii: and, according to other authorities, it is to be placed still earlier, at sixty.

bodily infirmity he was reduced a year or two before his death is well known to the readers of his history. It is incredible that Saul should be a stronger man at eighty than David was at seventy; and it is still more incredible that Saul, whose life was judicially abbreviated as it was, should yet exceed by ten years the utmost length of days, conceded to a king, whose piety and virtue rendered him the especial object of the Divine favour, and caused his reign to be crowned by so much of temporal prosperity*.

III. It is a just inference from 1 Sam. xiii. 13, 14. that, though David had not yet been formally appointed to the future kingdom in the stead of Saul, yet he was certainly alive at the time of that offence of Saul, and would be so appointed ere long. And this inference is still more confirmed by xv. 28; the time of which could not be many years later. If so, David was already born in the *third* year of Saul; and consequently David was *thirty-eight* years old in the *fortieth*. But this is directly contradictory to 2 Sam. v. 4, 5. which shews that when he began to reign, even in Hebron, he was still only *thirty*.

I think there is sufficient in these reasons to make it be acknowledged that very great difficulties would ensue, if we understood the *first* and *second* years in question of the two first years of Saul, as dated from

* 2 Sam. xix. 32. Barzillai is called a very aged man; and yet he was but eighty. Not that I would be understood to maintain, that no instances are on record of persons, who were able to go out to war at sixty, seventy, or eighty. On the contrary, there are many. See Plutarch, Agesilaus, 36, or Xenophon, Agesilaus, cap. ii. §. 28: Plutarch, Demetrius, 19: Æmi-

lius Paulus, 10: Marcellus, 28: Justin, xvii. 1: Lucian, Macrobian, *passim*. Alexander's veterans, called the Argyraspides, at the time of the last battle between Eumenes and Antigonus, B. C. 316, were none of them less than sixty, and some of them seventy years old and upwards. See Diodorus Sic. xix. 41: Plutarch, Eumenes, 16.

B. C. 1094. How then are we to avoid these consequences, and yet to retain the integrity of the text? I think it is possible to do both.

For first, insomuch as the length of Saul's reign in any sense is not asserted in the Old Testament at forty years, like that of David or Solomon, it will be entirely consistent with its testimony should it appear that the length of his reign must be stated in one sense, at forty years in reality, and in another, at only twenty-two.

Secondly, it is asserted by Josephus^z, that Samuel survived the appointment of Saul eighteen years, and Saul the death of Samuel twenty-two. The falsehood of this assertion, if it be understood of the actual death of Samuel, may be shewn so plainly, as to render it matter of surprise that any writer upon sacred chronology should ever have taken it for granted. If Samuel is supposed to have died in the *eighteenth* year of Saul, then the following absurdity is the consequence; David, whom no one will pretend to deny that Samuel anointed before he died, was anointed almost before he was born. For as David was *thirty* in the *fortieth* of Saul, it is manifest he was born in the *eleventh*, and was in his *eighth* year in the *eighteenth*. Now Samuel could not anoint David after the *eighteenth* of Saul, if he died in that year; though he might have anointed him in it. If so, he could not have anointed David after the *eighth* year of his age, though he might have anointed him in it. Yet when Samuel anointed David^a, it is an indisputable fact that he was old enough to be trusted with the care of his father's sheep—and either before this time, or soon after it^b, old enough to contend with, and to master, a lion and a bear in defence of his charge.

^z Ant. Jud. vi. xiii. 5. xiv. 9.
^b Ibid. xvii. 34—37.

^a 1 Sam xvi. 11, 12. Cf. Ps. lxxviii. 70, 71.

But will this be considered credible of a *child* only *eight* years old? And if such is the consequence of supposing David to have been anointed by Samuel only in the very year of his death, what must be the absurdity of supposing that he actually anointed him several years before his death! which yet is much more consistent with the truth. For the anointing of David is recorded xvi. 12, 13, and the death of Samuel xxv. 1, at a time, which it may be collected from xxvii. 7. xxix. 11. was probably not more than two years before the death of Saul: and this was the opinion of Clemens Alexandrinus also ^b.

The absurdity then of supposing that Samuel died in the *eighteenth* year of Saul, as dated from his original appointment, must be evident without further proof. It is very possible, however, that, dated from the original appointment of Saul, the preexisting administration of Samuel, which had been going on exclusively until then, might continue to go on conjointly with his for *eighteen* years afterwards. It is asserted, chapter vii. 15, that Samuel judged Israel *all the days of his life*; an assertion which surely requires to be understood of something more than an administration of twenty years merely, and much less of twelve; which is all that Josephus assigns him.

It is my opinion that Samuel was born about the tenth year of the administration of Eli; and that he was about thirty years old when he succeeded him in the office of judge. I attach no weight to the assertion of Josephus, that he began to prophesy, πεπληρωκὼς ἔτος ἡδὲ δωδέκατον^c—because it is a purely conjectural date, the ground of which has been pointed out Diss. xii. vol. i. 398: and the name of *child*, according to the Hebrew idiom, would still be applied to him

^b Stromatum i. xxi. 386. l. 1, 2.

^c Ant. v. x. 4.

any time between his *twelfth* and his *twentieth* year*. Nor is there any difficulty in conceiving that the first revelation might be made to him *ten* years or more before the death of Eli. Some considerable interval must have elapsed between 1 Sam. iii. 19, and the close of the preceding narrative: as well as between the end of 1 Sam. iii. and the beginning of 1 Sam. iv. The penal denunciations of the Divine Providence are seldom seen to be executed as soon as made: witness the cases of Jeroboam, Baasha, and Ahab: nor is it more extraordinary that the beginning of the punishment of the house of Eli should be delayed ten or fifteen years after it was first denounced, than that its final consummation should not take place until more than one hundred years later; when Abiathar was deposed from the priesthood by Solomon^d.

If, however, Samuel was about thirty at the time of the death of Eli, he would be about fifty at the time of the appointment of Saul; and sixty-eight in the eighteenth year of his reign: at which advanced age, if he had never yet done so before, he might well be supposed to retire from public life, or from the same actual share in the administration of the affairs of the kingdom, which he might have sustained until then. It will follow from this supposition, that the *one* and *two* years of the reign of Saul, which are mentioned 1 Sam. xiii. 1, are in reality the first *one* and *two* years of his sole reign; and virtually the *nineteenth* and *twentieth* since his original appointment: and the course of events, which begins and proceeds from xiii. 2,

* Gen. xxi. 14, 15, 16, &c. Ishmael is repeatedly called a *child* or *lad*, when he was certainly more than *fourteen*, and might be as much as *seventeen*. So likewise Benjamin, xliv. 20

—the end, though he was old enough to have children; and even had he been ten years younger than Joseph, he could not have been less than twenty.

^d 1 Kings ii. 27.

begins and proceeds from his twenty-first, or at the earliest from his twentieth itself. The advantages which immediately flow from this construction, and their uses in reconciling the accounts of Scripture with each other, or with general probabilities, are these.

First, it is not necessary to suppose that Saul was more than *twenty*, or at the utmost than *twenty-five* years old, when he was appointed king—nor than sixty, or sixty-five, at the time of his death. At the latest of the former of these extremes, he would still be strictly a *young* man; and at the latest of the latter he might still be able to go out to battle.

Secondly, it is not necessary to suppose that he was married before the first year of his reign; nor consequently that Jonathan his oldest son was more than thirty-nine years old at his death: in which case he would be *twenty* years old in the *twenty-first year* of Saul, and *nineteen* in his *twentieth*; and at either of these times would be capable of the exploit attributed to him 1 Sam. xiii. 2, 3. and xiv. Among his brothers, too, the sons of Saul and Ahinoam^e, Ishui (mentioned after Jonathan, and, as it appears, the same person with Ishbosheth) and Melchi-shua, might both be born by the twentieth or twenty-first of Saul; but not necessarily Abinadab: who yet might be born soon after, and still be of an age to go out to battle, by the fortieth.

Thirdly, David, who was born in the eleventh year of Saul, would be but nine or ten years younger than Jonathan, born as we suppose in his *first* or his *second*. And who is there, that reads the exquisite narrative of their wonderful friendship, but would suppose that, with the most entire congeniality in other respects, the difference of years between them could not have been too considerable? This argument alone is sufficient to

^e 1 Sam. xiv. 49.

convince us that Jonathan could not have been born earlier than the first or second year of the reign of Saul; for it would be difficult to believe that *his* soul could have been so intuitively knit with the soul of David^f, had not the kindred sympathies of one youthful mind with another cooperated with any other motive to produce so immediate and lasting an impression.

Fourthly, it is not necessary to suppose that David was anointed by Samuel before the sixteenth or seventeenth year of his age—the twenty-sixth or the twenty-seventh of the reign of Saul; nor that he slew Goliath before his nineteenth or his twentieth*, in the twenty-ninth or the thirtieth: and soon after this time he would manifestly be of an age to be married to Michal, the daughter of Saul; as the narrative supposes him to have been^g. But he might manifestly be alluded to, even in the twenty-first of Saul, and much more a few years after, as a person already in being, though not publicly known; and already fixed upon as Saul's successor in the kingdom, though not yet anointed.

Fifthly, at the time of the appointment of Saul, the Israelites were in no danger from any enemy but the Ammonites; the Philistines in particular, since the deliverance recorded at the outset of the administration of Samuel^h, had been quite subdued. Yet we find them resuming the offensive at the outset of xiii. 1. 3. and maintaining a constant warfare, xiv. 52. thenceforward to the end of the reign of Saul. But if they had been subdued *all* the *days* of Samuel, this would not be consistent, unless the days of Samuel were supposed to extend at least up to xiii. 1. 3. in the reign of Saul. If the *days* of Samuel, as such, really expired

* Theodorit, i. 381. in 1 Reg. when he slew Goliath, πεντεκαί-
Interr. 41: μειράκιον ἦν, sc. David, δεκα ἑτῶν ἢ ἑκκαίδεκα.

^f 1 Sam. xviii. 1.

^g Ibid. xviii. 17—27.

^h Ibid. vii. 3—12. 13.

in the eighteenth of Saul—then the Philistines, who might have been kept under, until then, by their dread of Samuel, might begin, in the nineteenth, to be again superior, or at least to oppose a formidable resistance.

Sixthly, 1 Sam. xiv. 3. Ahiah, a grandson of Phinehas, was ministering in the priest's office, in the second or third year of Saul; and xxi. 1. xxii. 9. 11. at a much later period, Ahimelech, his brother, was doing the same in his stead: and xxii. 20–23, Ahimelech had a son, Abiathar, already arrived at maturity: and this was probably not more than four or five years before the end of the reign of Saul. If Eli was ninety-eight years old at the time of his death, it is probable that Phinehas was not less than fifty-eight*: and if Phinehas had been married at thirty, his son, Ahitub, might be then twenty-eight. In this case, Ahiah a son of this Ahitub might be actually in office, forty years afterwards, in the twentieth of Saul; and Ahimelech, fifty-five years afterwards, in the thirty-fifth or thirty-sixth; and Abiathar, the son of Ahimelech, be fully arrived at maturity: yet not much more than sixty, at the beginning of the reign of Solomon.

Seventhly, it is not necessary to suppose that Samuel died more than two or three years before Saul, as the context very clearly implies; or about the eighty-eighth year of his age. The departure of David to Achish seems to have been produced by his death—and that was but one year and four months before the fatal battle of Gilboa: nor had Samuel been long dead when Saul applied to the witch of Endor; which could not have been many days before his own death.

* 1 Sam. i. 3. Hophni and Phinehas were both priests, and both acting in that capacity, the year before the birth of Samuel. They were probably then not

less than thirty at that time; in which case, Phinehas, at the death of Eli, thirty years after, would be sixty at least.

Lastly, the assertion of Josephus, that Saul reigned twenty-two years after the death of Samuel, is virtually corroborated by Eupolemus, apud Eusebiumⁱ: by Theophilus ad Autolycum^k: and by others—who all state the length of his reign ἀπλῶς at *twenty-one* or *twenty* years; which being dated from the eighteenth would be equivalent to thirty-nine: and the reign of Saul was actually thirty-nine years complete, but not forty. There seems, then, to have been always a current tradition that the reign of Saul in some sense was a reign of twenty-one, or twenty-two years, which the testimony of St. Paul proves to have been one of thirty-nine, or of forty. The origin of this tradition is explained by the distinction in question; that the first eighteen years of his reign were divided with Samuel, the remaining twenty-one or twenty-two were not. Considered in this light too, the administration of the Judges, which did not terminate except with the administration of Samuel, may be supposed not to have ceased before B. C. 1076, the beginning of the nineteenth of Saul. To this time from the date of the Eisodus, B. C. 1520, the interval would be 444 years; which might easily be called in round numbers 450. Vide supra, page 447—449*.

* Eusebius (Chronicon Armeno-Latinum, i. 170—172.) argues, as I have done, from the age of Ishbosheth at the death of Saul, that Saul must have reigned forty years; which he divides between Samuel and Saul. But he supposes further, that Saul's reign, properly so called, was but of two years' duration; that he fell away, and was given up to a re-

probate spirit, at the end of his *second* year; and therefore (he being as good as set aside) that the rest of his reign was to be reckoned as belonging to Samuel. Sulpicius Severus, *Sacra Historia*, i. 64. §. 8—14. mentions that most chronologers supposed Saul to have reigned thirty years: an opinion, however, with which he does not himself agree;

ⁱ *Præparatio Evangelica*, ix. 30. 447. B. D. ^k *Lib.* iii. cap. 24. 372. Cf. Julius Pollux, *Chronicon*, p. 104.

though for a reason, which is probably itself incorrect. He considers it best, on the authority of St. Paul, to allow his reign a period of forty years, divided, however, between him and Samuel. We may observe here also, that according to the same historian, *loco citato*, some chronologers supposed Samuel's

administration to have lasted seventy years; and though he remarks, *Unde hæc autoritas fuerit assumpta non reperi*, yet it would be very consistent with the hypothesis that he was about twenty at the time of the prediction of the death of Eli,¹ Sam. iii. 18, and about ninety at the time of his own death.

APPENDIX.

SUPPLEMENT TO DISSERTATION XII.

Further consideration of Daniel x. 13.

THERE is one construction of Daniel x. 13, not noticed in the preceding Dissertation, which, if admitted to be true, would deprive that text of all value as supplying a chronological argument, to determine the interval between the death of Evil-merodach and the accession of Darius; and that is, to understand the one and twenty days, there mentioned, of the three “weeks of days,” or “full weeks,” alluded to x. 2 previously; for which Daniel was mourning and fasting, before he had the vision recorded in this and the following chapters.

It must be acknowledged that most of the commentators on the Book of Daniel, both ancient and modern, have understood the note of time at verse 13, with this reference to verse 2 of the tenth chapter in question: and it must also be admitted, that if we look only at the interval of time, specified in each instance, there would seem to be some reason for it; for three full weeks of days, and twenty-one days literally understood, amount to the same thing. Add to which, that Daniel was mourning and fasting for that length of time; and this may seem to be the same thing with that “setting his heart to understand,” and that “chastening himself before his God,” which are alluded to at verse 12: from the first day of his doing which also he was there told by the Angel, that “his words had been heard,” and that “he was come for his words.”

It would seem a natural inference from this allusion also, that the first day in question is to be understood of the first of the one and twenty days' fasting and mourning; and, consequently, when the Angel proceeds to observe, "But the Prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days;" it seems equally reasonable to conclude that, but for the opposition of the Prince of the kingdom of Persia, the Angel, who came for the words of Daniel at the end of his three weeks' fast, would have come for the same reason at the beginning of it; and therefore that the one and twenty days, between the first hearing of the words of Daniel, and the actual coming of the Angel, and the one and twenty days' opposition of the Prince of the kingdom of Persia, denote the same interval of time in each instance.

In answer to this objection, which after all is more specious than true, it may be replied, first, that if it was the case, as the Angel declared to Daniel, that from the first day that "he set his heart to understand and to chasten himself before his God, his words had been heard; and he was come for his words;" the most natural and obvious construction of this declaration would be to refer it to Daniel ix. 1, and the following verses; especially as Daniel is there represented to be doing, before the appearance of the Angel on that occasion, the very thing which is here implied by setting his heart to understand, and chastening himself before his God: see ver. 2, 3, 4-19: and his being so employed is also represented as the moving cause why the Angel was sent to him, to reveal the subject-matter of the prophecy there recorded; and the last of these things so critically the effect of the former, that the command to the Angel to go forth was issued at the very beginning of the supplications of Daniel which led to it: see ver. 20-23.

On this principle, the first day alluded to x. 13, as the day from which the words of Daniel had been heard, would have no more right to be referred to the third of Cyrus, x. 1, 2, than to the first of Darius, ix. 1, 2: in which case the one and twenty days' opposition of the Prince of the kingdom of Persia, if that was the reason why they had not been answered sooner, could have nothing to do with Daniel's three weeks' fast; for between the first of Darius and the third of Cyrus, the interval far exceeded the duration of this three weeks' fast.

In the next place, an opposition of one and twenty days, if literally understood of a three weeks' duration only, would seem to be much too insignificant a circumstance to be specially mentioned and insisted upon, in an account of an interview between Daniel and the angel Gabriel, so remarkable as this, and ushered in by a vision of so glorious a character as the manifestation of the second Person in the Trinity to the eyes of the prophet Daniel, under the same form and with the same attributes of dignity and majesty, externally, in which he afterwards appeared to St. John in the Apocalypse, (i. 13-16): for that the person who appears, and is described as appearing to Daniel, at x. 5, 6, is our Lord Jesus Christ, or God Incarnate, the second Person of the Holy Trinity in an human but glorified form; there can be no question: especially, when this one and twenty days' opposition, so understood, is assigned as the reason why the words of Daniel should not have been sooner heard; in other words, why a vision of so sublime a nature should not have been sooner vouchsafed to him: especially too, when the nature of the parties concerned in the opposition on both sides is considered—the Prince of the kingdom of Persia, if not likewise the Prince of the kingdom of

Grecia, on the one hand, and the angel Gabriel, and Michael, one of the chief, or one of the first Princes, and the Prince of Daniel and of his people in particular, on the other: for that these are designations of real beings, and of beings superior to human, on the one side, and therefore in all probability on the other too, can scarcely admit of a doubt. Now between opposing parties of this mysterious but exalted description—the angelic being, Gabriel, and the super-angelic being, Michael, one of the first or chief Princes, that is, one of the three Persons of the undivided Trinity itself, on the one side, and the corresponding antagonist principles of powers and potentates like these, the Prince of Persia and the Prince of Grecia, on the other; an opposition and a contest of three weeks' duration, and directed to no other purpose, than whether the answer to the words of Daniel should take place three weeks of days sooner, or three weeks of days later; (with submission and reverence be it spoken;) does appear incongruous to the spirit of the whole description, disproportionate to the greatness and solemnity of the occasion, and disparaging to the dignity of the parties concerned in it on both sides.

In the third place, no one, perhaps, would have imagined the fact of a reference at x. 13, 14, to the fasting and mourning alluded to x. 2, 3, but for the turn which the English version has given to the original, in rendering the latter part of verse 12: "And I am come for thy words," and in introducing the next verse by the adversative particle, "But." One could scarce help concluding from the first of these versions, that the Angel was *just* come in consequence of Daniel's words; and from the other, that he would have come sooner, *but* for the opposition of the Prince of Persia. The original, however, does not necessarily sanction

either of these conclusions. The latter part of verse 12 might just as well have been rendered, “And *I came* for thy words,” as, “I am come for thy words;” and the particle which is rendered by “But” in verse 13, might still more correctly have been rendered by “And,” which is its proper meaning as it stands in the text.

The truth is, as it appears to me, the whole of this tenth chapter of Daniel, or that part of it which contains the account of the words of the Angel, more particularly, labours under an ambiguity in the English version, which does not exist in the original; partly because the position of some things in it, which are parenthetically interposed, and should have been distinguished accordingly, has not been attended to; and partly because the language of history or simple narrative has not been preserved throughout it, as I conceive it should have been, in an historical or recapitulatory summary like this, which refers exclusively to the past, without any allusion to what was present or passing, or had been so recently, at the time. In my own opinion, if this tenth chapter is to be rightly understood, it is to be taken in connexion with the eighth; it being remembered only, that though connected with it in point of reference, or community of subject throughout, it is yet considerably separated from it in point of time; the eighth chapter belonging to the third of Belshazzar, and the tenth to the third of Cyrus.

In support of this opinion, it is necessary to observe that the Book of Daniel admits of being divided into two halves or sections, the historical and the prophetic; the former of which requires to be distinguished from the latter. The former is comprehended between chapter i. and chapter vi. inclusive of both; the latter between chapter vii. and the end of the book. The

former begins with the third of Jehoiakim, or the first of Nebuchadnezzar, reckoned from the time of his association in the empire with his father; that is, from what is equivalent to both, B. C. 606: and ends with the first of Cyrus, as next in succession to Darius, B. C. 536; comprehending a period of seventy years, or the duration of the Jewish captivity from first to last. See Daniel i. 1. 5. 21: ii. 1: v. 31. The prophetical part begins at vii. 1, in the first of Belshazzar, B. C. 561, and ends at x. 1, in the third of Cyrus, B. C. 534; between which extremes, respectively, the interval is twenty-seven years.

For that the first of the *visions* of Daniel, in other words, the first portion of the prophetical matter, contained in this book, without any mixture of historical, properly so called, bears date from the first of Belshazzar, appears from vii. 1: and that the second does so in the third of Belshazzar, appears from viii. 1: and these dates, if we are right in the conclusions which we have endeavoured to establish—first that Belshazzar was the same with Evil-merodach, the son of Nebuchadnezzar; and secondly, with regard to the end and beginning of his reign respectively—are the same with B. C. 561, on the one hand, and B. C. 559, on the other. But after this second vision, there is no mention of any third one, like either of the former, before x. 1, bearing date in the third of Cyrus; which if literally understood of the third of Cyrus' sole reign, after the death of Darius, would answer to B. C. 534. We have, it is true, the account of a prophecy interposed in chapter the ninth, the date of which was the first of Darius, B. C. 538: the celebrated prophecy of the seventy weeks. But the account of this prophecy is not the account of a vision, like either of those which preceded, in chapter vii. and viii. respectively; or like

that which follows in chapters x. xi. xii. to the end : nor is the subject-matter of this prophecy connected with that of the prophetic disclosures in chapters vii. and viii. which preceded ; like that of chapters xi. and xii. which follow. We are justified, therefore, in contending that the continuation of Daniel's visions, strictly so called, after chapter viii. is found in chapter x : and being there resumed, that one and the same thread of prophecy which had been suspended at chapter viii. is carried forward through the xith and xiith chapters to the end of the book : for it requires no proof, that all the matter, from xi. 2. to xii. 13, though divided into two distinct chapters, is yet one and the same in itself, and with what had preceded in chapters vii. and viii. respectively. The chronological series then of Daniel's visions, properly so called, is from the first of Belshazzar to the third ; and from the third of Belshazzar to the third of Cyrus. Between the first of Belshazzar and the third, there was no renewal of his visions as such, or none which is upon record ; and between the third of Belshazzar and the third of Cyrus, the same thing holds good. If a prophecy is interposed in the first of Darius, it is a prophecy *sui generis*, and devoted to a different subject from any of the visions before or after it.

Now, as in the account of the vision recorded in the eighth chapter, there is a reference to the vision related in the seventh, (Compare viii. 1. with vii. 1, &c.) so it appears to me, in the account of this vision in the tenth, there is a reference to that in the eighth. Let it only be granted that, as the instrument employed to interpret these visions to Daniel, notwithstanding the difference of the times and occasions on which they were vouchsafed, must have been some definite agent or other, so it was most probably one and the same in each ; espe-

cially as the occasions themselves, however different in point of time, were yet connected by a community of relation and purpose, and the visions respectively vouchsafed upon each, were devoted to disclosures *communis generis* in each instance, and carrying on the same train of prophetic history from first to last. This presumption appears only reasonable. Let it therefore be taken for granted, that the party conversing with Daniel, in all these instances, in what manner soever described, whether as simply under the image of an hand appearing to him, or in any other way, and even when indefinitely alluded to, unless the contrary is distinctly specified, or unless there is reason to suspect it from the context, is some one and the same Divine messenger; as at vii. 16, 23: viii. 13. x. 10. 18—xii. 4*. If this was the case, there will probably appear to be no reason, why the Angel employed on these various commissions to Daniel should not be supposed the angel Gabriel. The angel Gabriel is spe-

* The only exception to the above presumption would appear to be in that part of the twelfth chapter, which follows from verse 5 to the end, in which, a comparison of xii. 6, 7. with x. 5. will demonstrate that the speaker at xii. 7. must be the same Divine being who appeared to Daniel at the outset of the xth chapter; and whom we have seen to be the second Person in the Holy Trinity, in his Incarnate capacity. Yet in what follows from xii. 8. to the end, there is no reason why the speaker addressed by Daniel at xii. 8. and who answers him from xii. 9, to the end, should not be the same with whom he had been conversing up to xii. 5. There is no reason why the ac-

count of the vision from xii. 5—7. should not be considered a parenthesis between xii. 4. and xii. 8. For Daniel, xii. 5. alludes to *other two*, which recognises the person with whom he had been conversing until then, as a distinct person, who-soever he was: and the language of xii. 9. in the answer of the person addressed by him at xii. 8, just before, (a question founded on the words of the speaker at xii. 7,) is so far the same with that of xii. 4, the last words of the angel with whom Daniel had been conversing uninterruptedly from x. 11, to the account of this vision at xii. 5. that the one may well be considered as the resumption and continuation of the other.

cified by name, on two several occasions, as the actual instrument to make certain prophetical communications to Daniel; the occasion recorded in ch. viii. and the occasion recorded in chapter ix. the former the second of Daniel's visions, the latter the prophecy of the seventy weeks: and there is a reference on the second of these occasions of his ministry to his similar ministry on the former: see ix. 21. and viii. 16. If some one instrument, then, was employed upon all these occasions, there will appear to be little question that this instrument was most probably the angel Gabriel in the rest, who was actually the instrument in two of them*.

* The speaker distinctly specified as Gabriel at viii. 15, 16, may also have been that same saint, indefinitely mentioned at verse 13, just before, as another saint, "and as speaking to that certain saint," or as the margin has it, to that "Numberer of secrets," whom Daniel had just heard speaking (see v. 13.) and whose answer to the saint in question alleges the disclosure contained in verse 14. This "Numberer of secrets," or "Wonderful Numberer," if the Hebrew term, by which it is so expressed, *Phelamouni* or *Palmoni*, be rightly so rendered, might very well be some one distinct from the other saints, and more akin to the personage, described at xii. 7, or x. 5, 6, than to any other, who appears, or is mentioned, in the Book of Daniel: but there is no reason why the saint who speaks to him, and whose question elicits that answer which defines the time of the vision, as at viii. 14, might not be the saint, or holy angel, Gabriel, and the same who was afterwards commissioned to make

Daniel understand the vision, as at viii. 15, and commissioned too, we may presume, by the same Numberer of secrets, or Wonderful Numberer, before adverted to, himself.

With respect to the above denomination, *Phelamouni* or *Palmoni*, which occurs only once in the Hebrew text, the Septuagint version and Theodotion, have rendered it as a proper name; and consequently retained it in the text. We learn from Jerome, iii. 1105, *ad calcem*, in Dan. viii. that Aquila did the same. Symmachus alone appears to have rendered it by *τῶι ποτε*, or *nescio cui*; a version which Jerome followed himself, and which our translators seem to have thought preferable. But between the marginal sense ascribed to this word, and *nescio cui*, or *τῶι ποτε*, the difference is wide indeed; yet if the word be compounded as it appears to be of *פלא*, wonderful, and *מנה*, to number, the marginal sense would seem to be the true. And analogous as this designation appears to be to that of Wonder-

Now, with these observations premised, remembering that the instrument employed on these several occasions to interpret Daniel's visions, or to communicate new prophetic revelations of the same kind, was in all probability one and the same, the angel Gabriel; that Daniel's visions were only three in number; that the dates of these three, respectively, coincided with the first of Belshazzar, the third of Belshazzar, and the third of Cyrus; that there was no vision like either of the preceding, between the third of Belshazzar and the third of Cyrus, that is, between B. C. 559 and B. C. 534, an interval of twenty-five years: we shall not be surprised to find the renewal of these prophetic visions and disclosures, in the third of Cyrus, ushered in by a specific reference to the visions and their interpretations, which had preceded in the first or in the third of Belshazzar. In my own opinion, we have that reference from x. 10, to xi. 2: and of the two visions previous to the present—that in the first of Belshazzar, cap. vii. and that in the third, cap. viii—in my opinion also the reference is rather to the second, than to the first.

For first, I cannot help being of opinion, that when the Angel tells Daniel, at x. 12, that “from the first day that he set his heart to understand, and to chasten himself before his God, his words were heard, and he came for his words;” he means by this understanding, the understanding of his visions more particularly; to have been permitted to see which, without being enabled to comprehend them also, would have been no

ful, Counsellor, applied to Immanuel or God Incarnate, Isaiah ix. 6. I cannot help being of their opinion, who consider it to be applied to the same person here; and the same person who

is afterwards represented in the Apocalypse, under the figure of the Lamb, as opening the seals of the sealed book, and revealing the secrets of futurity to the end of time.

great privilege or distinction vouchsafed to the prophet himself; and to interpret or make known which intelligibly to his comprehension, was the actual object of the mission of the Angel to him. Now all this is literally applicable to the description at viii. 15, which represents Daniel as anxiously “seeking for the vision,” that is, for the meaning of the vision, which he had just seen, and to viii. 16—19, which represents Gabriel as expressly commanded to “make him to understand the vision,” and as “coming near to him” for that purpose accordingly. I cannot consider it so applicable to vii. 15, 16, also; though that may describe Daniel as actuated by an equal, if not by a stronger anxiety to know the meaning of what he had there too seen; for he is there described as asking for information of his own accord, and not as receiving it from a messenger sent on purpose to give it: and though the saint from whom he receives it might peradventure be Gabriel, yet he did not give it him in discharge of an actual commission to that effect.

Again, it seems to me a reasonable inference from x. 13, compared with x. 12, that if the Angel who came because of the words of Daniel, and who, when he came, was opposed by the Prince of Persia, and having so come, and being so opposed by the Prince of Persia, “had remained *there* with the kings of Persia;” it seems, I say, a just and reasonable inference from this description, that Daniel, and he, were both in Persia, when he first came because of his words; and wherever Daniel might subsequently be, that the Angel remained in Persia. Now it is a remarkable coincidence, that at the time of the vision, recorded viii. 2, &c. Daniel was either bodily, or (*pro tanto*, and so far as regarded the purposes of the vision) in spirit, in Persia; for Shusan, in the province of Elam, where he was, or

where he believed himself to be, was Susa, in the province of Persis; and the river Ulai, twice alluded to, 2 and 16, was a river that flowed by Susa, called Eulæus, and under that name described by Strabo, Pliny, Marcion of Heraclea*, and others. It is another coincidence that at the time of this vision in the third of Cyrus, Daniel was actually somewhere on the banks of the Hiddekel or Tigris, x. 1, 4; the same river which is again mentioned xii. 5, 6: and wheresoever this might be, it could not be any where in the neighbourhood of Susa, in particular; for Susa was not situated upon the Tigris, though the Tigris might skirt the province of Susiana, and fall into the Sinus Persicus. It is another coincidence, that the Angel having been left in Persia, as we collected by implication from viii. 2, 16: and as is plainly declared at x. 13: speaks at x. 20, of returning to Persia, after this vision, and its interpretation, which clearly implies that he had come thence in order to it. It is another coincidence that at xi. 1, which ought to have made a part of the continuation of the tenth chapter, he speaks of the first of Darius, and of something which he did in that year, viz. strengthen and confirm Darius; implying, as we may presume, that he had been engaged in doing something of the same kind in general, though possibly different in particular, for the time before that; which something is consistently explained, if we suppose him to mean that he was employed for the interval between the third of Belshazzar, and the first of Darius, in contending with the Prince of Persia; and in that year itself, in strengthening and confirming Darius; but both for the same purpose, viz. the seconding and maturing the counsels of God for the benefit of the

* Strabo, xv. 3. §. 4. 201: graphi Minores, i. Susianæ Periplus, p. 18.
§. 22. 235: Pliny, vi. 31: Geo-

people of Daniel, and the people of Michael, their Prince—the sole aider and abettor in these things, of Gabriel himself, his fellow-labourer and fellow-champion in the same behalf.

These reasons appear to me competent to prove that in the tenth chapter of Daniel there is a special reference to the circumstances of the second of his visions, and the last which he had had before that which is now recorded ; a reference nothing extraordinary, after an intermission of twenty-five years in the series of these visions themselves. It is an historical chapter, then, throughout, and serves both as a resumption of the series of former prophetic disclosures, and as the introduction to a new revelation, which both continues and consummates the former. I cannot but think that our English version has not done justice to it in this respect ; nor so preserved the language of the original throughout, as to shew this reference in it to the past : which yet might easily have been done. Under this impression, I shall take the liberty of laying before the reader a slightly altered version of so much of it at least as relates to the words of the angel Gabriel ; beginning at verse 12.

12. And he said to me : Fear not, Daniel : for from the first day that thou settedst (gavest) thine heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard, and I came for (in) thy words.

13. And *the* Prince of *the* kingdom of Persia *was* withstanding me one and twenty days ; and behold Michael, one of the Princes, the first *ones*, came to help me : and I remained there with *the* kings of Persia.

14. And I am come to make thee understand that which shall come to pass unto thy people, in *the* end of the days : for yet *is it* vision for days.....

20. And he said ; Hast thou known wherefore I

am come unto thee? and now shall I return to war with *the* Prince of Persia: and I *was* going forth, and behold, *the* Prince of Javan came.

21. But I will declare to thee the thing *which is* noted in scripture of truth. And not one, *that is* strengthening himself with me, upon these *things*, except Michael your Prince.

xi. 1. And I, in *the* first year of Darius the Mede, *was standing* my standing to strengthen and to confirm him.

2. And now will I shew thee truth.

We observed before that some things in this address required to be understood parenthetically, which the Bible version had not distinguished accordingly. This is particularly the case with verses x. 20, 21. and xi. 1, 2. It seems to me that the sense of these passages would be best expressed, if we stated them as follows:

And he said; Hast thou known wherefore I am come unto thee? And I *was* going forth, and behold, *the* Prince of Javan came. But I will declare to thee the thing *which is* noted in scripture of truth.

And now shall I return to war with *the* Prince of Persia: and not one, *that is* strengthening himself with me, upon these *things*, except Michael your Prince. And I, in the first year of Darius, *was standing* my standing to strengthen and to confirm him.

And now will I shew thee truth.

The Angel had explained to Daniel the reason of his coming; partly in verses 11, 12, and partly in verse 14: and therefore might well ask him, in verse 20, Hast thou known wherefore I am come unto thee? a reason so important, as far as Daniel at least was concerned, and so personally interesting to him, that though the angel Gabriel's proper place was with the

Kings of Persia, and his proper employment while there, to contend with the Prince of the kingdom of Persia; he had been expressly dispatched from thence, to discharge this particular commission in behalf of the prophet Daniel: he had consequently left his proper place vacant, and the discharge of his proper duty in abeyance, for a time, to come on this errand to Daniel. And as an additional means to enable him to judge of the importance attached to his coming, and of the special privilege conceded to himself thereby; he tells him of this further fact, that not only was the Prince of Persia meanwhile to be left behind, while he came on this errand to him, but that as he himself was going forth, the Prince of Javan, that is, Grecia, came.

The received translation has rendered these words as future; "And when I am gone forth, lo! the Prince of Grecia shall come;" in which, as it appears to me, it has greatly mistaken the sense of the original, and greatly endangered the right understanding of the passage: for the first impression from this version would be, that when Gabriel was gone forth, the Prince of Grecia would come to take his place; and consequently either to fight with the Prince of Persia, as he himself had done, or to be the means of fresh communications to Daniel, as he had been; both which constructions of the Angel's meaning, I apprehend, would be far from the truth.

But the truth is, that the Hebrew admits of these words' being rendered as simply historical or past; a version which would obviously be much more consistent with the context, than the other. For surely this going forth of the Angel is to be understood of his setting out from where he was; viz. with the Kings of Persia; upon his errand to Daniel: in which case,

he must be understood to say, that as he was setting forth upon that errand the Prince of Javan came. But who was this Prince of Javan? and what the purpose of his coming? Doubtless, if it be true, as the Angel directly afterwards asserts, that not one held with himself upon these things, but Michael, the Prince of Daniel and his people, it was some enemy of Gabriel's and Michael's, both, as much as the Prince of Persia; and the object of his coming was to make common cause with the Prince of Persia in opposing them both. The coming then of such an one was the arrival of one enemy more, in addition to that whom Gabriel had before to encounter; and whom he was preparing to leave behind him, by going on this errand to Daniel: yet notwithstanding this, he tells him he had come on this errand, in his behalf; and he should not return until he had accomplished it, by declaring unto him the thing which was noted in scripture of truth: in other words, until he had made him acquainted with so much of the future, in reference to himself and his people, as was already determined on in the counsels of God, and already recorded on the tablets of heaven, and in due time should infallibly come to pass. He reminds him also that in the first year of Darius he was standing to strengthen and to confirm him, though that too was something over and above his proper commission, if Darius was reigning in Media or Babylon, but the Angel's place was with the Kings of Persia; and in like manner now also would he declare to Daniel truth. And this business accomplished, he tells him he should return, to war with the Prince of Persia, that is, go back again where he was before, and to his former employment; though there too, he gives him to understand that he should wage that contest alone,

or with none to assist him, but Michael, Daniel's Prince, and the Prince of his people.

I cannot help thinking that the above is a faithful representation of the exordium of the Angel's address, before he proceeds to the proper execution of his commission, in that revelation of the future which begins at xi. 2, and continues to the end of the book. To return then to the point from which we set out: What evidence do we perceive in these words, of a reference to the three weeks of Daniel's fasting and mourning? and how unworthy of the solemnity and importance of the occasion, if I may again be permitted the observation, would such a reference, supposing it existed, now appear! If so, the argument from the one and twenty days, that they denote so many years, beginning in the third of Belshazzar, remains so far unshaken. But where, we may ask, do they terminate? In the third of Cyrus, the date of this present vision? or at some earlier period? Not in the third of Cyrus, and consequently at some earlier period. For during that one and twenty days' opposition of the Prince of Persia, Gabriel remained with the Kings of Persia: which clearly implies that all that time he did not stir from thence. These one and twenty days, then, were not only one and twenty days of opposition from the Prince of Persia, but of Gabriel's continuance with the Kings of Persia. These twenty-one days, then, must have been over, if it appears that Gabriel after a certain time was no longer with the Kings of Persia, but somewhere else; and it appears that he was no longer with the Kings of Persia, but somewhere else, on two several occasions—once, as he tells us, when he stood up to strengthen and to confirm Darius, and again, when he came on this errand to Daniel. On the one of these occasions he was with Darius in Media

or Babylon; and on the other with Daniel on the Tigris. And whichever of these two was prior in point of time to the other, the twenty-one days of opposition alluded to, which must have expired when Gabriel first quitted Persia, would expire first and properly with that. Now the occasion when Gabriel was with Darius in Media or Babylon, was prior in point of time to that when he was with Daniel on the Tigris. He himself alludes to it on the second occasion, as a past event. The twenty-one days therefore expired properly with that occasion; and that occasion was in the first year of Darius. The twenty-one days therefore expired properly in the first of Darius; and we have seen that they began in the third of Belshazzar. If so, between the third of Belshazzar and the first of Darius, there was exactly one and twenty days' interval; and consequently if these days are to be understood of years, (which after what has been shewn, no one, I should think, will be disposed to call in question,) of one and twenty years.

As we observed in the last Dissertation, the accession of Darius the Mede to the throne of Nebuchadnezzar, was a change in the reigning dynasty, which brought the purposes of Providence with respect to the restoration of the Jews, so much the nearer to their consummation. The seventy years' captivity was even then on the point of expiring. In two years after the accession of Darius, the Jews would return to their native land. The proximity of this event, and its connection with the accession of Darius, are most clearly illustrated by the fact that the same point of time was selected as the moment at which to reveal the prophecy of the seventy weeks—the date of which was in the first of Darius; a prophecy which presupposes the restoration and return of the Jews. Yet the accession

of Darius was not absolutely the commencement of a new dynasty: for if it be true, as our other authorities have implied, that his father's sister was the wife of Nebuchadnezzar, and the mother of Evil-merodach, or Belshazzar, himself; then, in defect of the line of Nebuchadnezzar, through Belshazzar, the throne might seem to have devolved upon Darius in something like lineal descent. The years of the captivity were destined to be coextensive with the duration of the Babylonian empire; and that, too, consequently must last seventy years as well as the other. Though therefore the deliverance of the Jews might be at hand, in the first of Darius, it was not yet come; and though the Babylonian empire might be ready to pass to the Persians, when it had devolved upon the Medes, it had not yet passed to them before the first of Cyrus. We may perceive, then, a reason why the angel Gabriel, in his proper vocation as the champion of the people of Daniel, aided and supported by Michael their Prince, should stand up to strengthen and confirm Darius, at the beginning of his reign; and yet the opposition of the Prince of Persia, to himself and Michael, be continuing just the same. Upon that strengthening and confirming of the kingdom in the hands of Darius, we may presume, would depend its ultimately passing into the hands of Cyrus: into whose hands it must pass, before the Jewish captivity could come to an end. We know not the actual circumstances under which the kingdom of Babylon really passed from Nabonadius the last of its possessors, to Darius the Mede. There is an hiatus, upon this subject, in the Book of Daniel, which is very imperfectly supplied from other sources. But we may well presume it was not without a contest of some kind, and not without trouble and danger, if not uncertainty and insecurity.

rity, before Darius was firmly established on the throne.

And as to the opposition of the Prince of Persia, which had begun so long before this time, there is no reason why it might not continue long after it also; and it appears in fact that it was actually continuing in the third of Cyrus, five years later than the first of Darius, at least; for the Angel tells Daniel that even after discharging his commission to him, he should return to war with the Prince of Persia, that is, to renew the same contest as before. If the third of Cyrus is rightly to be understood of the third of his reign, dated from the death of Darius, the Jews had been restored two years at least before this time. But we know that even in the reign of Cyrus, very soon after their return, attempts were made by their enemies, both to stop the building of the temple, and to impede the peaceable settlement of the country, and the final restoration of their government and laws. Their adversaries, we are told at Ezra, iv. 5, in particular, hired counsellors against them, that is, persons to injure and impede their interests, by bringing them into discredit with the reigning monarch, all the days of Cyrus himself, as well as afterwards, through the reigns of Cambyses and Smerdis (see Ezra, iv. 6. 7.) unto the days of Darius king of Persia. If there was such an opposition in the reign of Cyrus, it might already have begun to work, by the third of his reign, notwithstanding the favour extended to the Jews in his first; and it might be his knowledge of that fact, and his grief at the success of the enemies of his countrymen, that gave occasion to the fasting and mourning of Daniel, alluded to at the outset of his tenth chapter.

It is time, however, that we should pass to the consideration of a question, which will be readily allowed

to be the most difficult part of our subject; viz. What we are to understand by the Prince of Persia, mentioned in verse 13 and 20, and by the Prince of Grecia, mentioned in verse 20? I am well aware that the opinion, which I ventured to express upon this subject, page 513, *supra*, though going no further than the statement of a belief in the personal existence and personal agency of beings of some kind, so called, is apparently opposed to the authority of bishop Horsley, in his sermon on Daniel iv. 17; where he takes occasion to review the doctrine of tutelar or guardian angels, and to examine the passages in the Book of Daniel, which might seem to give countenance to it. The judgment which he pronounces upon the rest of these passages will be found in the sermon in question; but as to these texts in particular, he gives it as his opinion, that “the Princes of Persia, in the Book of Daniel, are to be understood of a party in the Persian state, which opposed the return of the captive Jews, first after the death of Cyrus, and again after the death of Darius Hystaspis:” and, “the Prince of Grecia,” in like manner, “of a party in the Greek empire, which persecuted the Jewish religion after the death of Alexander the Great, particularly in the Greek kingdom of Syria.” Horsley’s Sermons, third edition, 1812. vol. ii. p. 378.

With respect to the doctrine of tutelar or guardian angels, if understood in the sense in which bishop Horsley opposes it, and labours to confute it, I do not think it is properly concerned in the solution of the question, what is to be understood by the Prince of Persia or the Prince of Grecia, in the present instance. Upon the truth or the falsehood of that doctrine, therefore, the reader is at liberty to concur with the bishop, or to dissent from him, as he thinks best. But with

regard to the decision of this particular question, as stated in the above extract from his sermon, much as the authority of bishop Horsley deserves to be respected, and much as we are bound to defer to his deliberate opinion upon any point which concerns the interpretation of the Old or New Testament, I cannot hesitate to declare my conviction, that nothing can be more unsatisfactory, than this method of solving the difficulties of scripture, nothing more vague and indefinite, than this mode of explaining its language.

For in the first place, it is not the Princes of Persia, as the representation of the bishop would imply, of whom the Angel speaks at Daniel x. 13 and 20, but the Prince of Persia. He speaks, it is true, of the Kings of Persia, at verse 13; but under a different name from that which he gives to the Prince of Persia, and not in the singular, as there, but in the plural. Nor let any one imagine that this objection is merely verbal, and a captious exception against an unguarded use of words; or that it proceeds on the supposition of a distinction without a difference. The use of words in speaking upon this subject should be regulated by the language of scripture; which gives us authority for speaking of the Prince of Persia, but none for speaking of the Princes of Persia. And as to the supposition of a distinction without a difference—the truth may turn out to be, that between the Kings of Persia and the Prince of Persia, in the language of scripture, there may be the widest difference; and how many soever these Kings of Persia might be, there could be only one such Prince.

In the next place, supposing the Prince of Persia, in this instance, and the Prince of Grecia, in the next, to denote a political party of some kind or other, the one in Persia, the other in Greece; what shall we under-

stand by the Prince of Tyrus, apostrophized in Ezekiel xxviii. 2-19? The Prince of Tyrus is a mode of speaking analogous to the Prince of Persia, or the Prince of Grecia; and if that mode of speaking is scriptural language for a faction or party, in either of these instances, it seems only reasonable to conclude that it must be scriptural language for a faction or party in the other. True it is, that Ezekiel uses a different word, xxviii. 2, to describe this Prince, from that which is employed, Daniel x. 13 and 20, to designate the Prince of Persia, or the Prince of Greece; but a word which denotes Prince as much as that, and is translated *ἄρχων* by the Septuagint version, in Ezekiel, as much as the other by Theodotion, in the book of Daniel. Now what faction or party can possibly be intended by Ezekiel's apostrophe to the Prince of Tyrus, ch. xxviii. 2-19? or as he is there also denominated, the *anointing* and *covering cherub*? If so, the Prince of Tyrus in this passage of Ezekiel, is not scriptural language for a political party; and by parity of consequence, neither the Prince of Persia nor the Prince of Grecia, in Daniel: for the one is precisely analogous to the other; and in the stated use of terms, the one must mean something analogous to the other. Bishop Horsley, indeed, has not considered this text; because it was not one of those which occurred in the Book of Daniel. But that it might obviously have been suggested by those which do occur there, and that if it presented itself, it was deserving of a few words of explanation to reconcile it with them, no one, perhaps, will deny.

Again, it is a singular violence to the common use of words, and a singular departure from the established modes of speech, to call a party or faction the Prince of Persia, or the Prince of Grecia; especially when we

consider the word which is employed in each of these instances. This word in the original is $\pi\alpha\rho$: which the Septuagint renders by $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, Theodotion and others of the Hexapla by $\alpha\rho\chi\omega\nu$: and it properly denotes a captain, commander, or governor. But what propriety would there be in calling a party or faction the $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ or $\alpha\rho\chi\omega\nu$ of Persia, or the $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ or $\alpha\rho\chi\omega\nu$ of Greece, particularly when it appears that this faction or party was not dominant or ruler in either; but that Persia at least, if not Greece, had its king or its ruler, strictly so called, and distinct from this faction or party, all the time?

But again, that we may waive the objection from the use of language altogether, what shall we say to the singular anachronism, involved in the bishop's opinion, that a Prince of Persia, and a Prince of Greece, whether some one person or a party of persons, whom the angel Gabriel so plainly describes as existing, and acting in their proper capacity, at least as early as the third of Cyrus, should neither begin to exist, nor to act, until 48 years later than the third of Cyrus, in one of these instances, and 211 years later in the other? For between the third of Cyrus, B. C. 534, and the death of Darius Hystaspis, B. C. 486, which the bishop assumes as the date of the rise of one of these parties, the interval is 48 years; and between the same date and the death of Alexander, B. C. 323, which he assumes as the date of the rise of the other, the interval is 211.

Again, if the Prince of Persia and the Prince of Grecia are to be understood of a party or faction, the one in Persia and the other in Greece; then these terms, instead of denoting a person or persons in either of these instances, denote an abstraction in both: for that a party or faction, as opposed to a personal agent,

is a mere abstraction, no one, I should think, will deny. What shall we say, then, to the representation of the angel Gabriel, that this Prince of Persia or this Prince of Greece, or both, that is, this mere abstraction—this mere generality—this simple notion of an accident without a subject—was the proper coordinate, but opposing, principle, or as the Greek language would express it, the ἀντίστοιχον, of himself and Michael? the proper antagonist with whom they had both been contending for twenty-one years past or more, before this interview with Daniel, and with whom they should have to contend for some time, more or less, to come, even after this interview with the prophet? Will it be maintained that Gabriel is not a person, or that Michael is not a person? And if not, how can it be contended that the proper antagonist principle of both, or of either of them, can be other than a person also? For what can be the coordinate of a person, as such, but a person, as such? or of an abstraction as such, but an abstraction as such? We have an example of this distinction, and an argument in point to the proper use of terms with reference to it, at 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15: where St. Paul is contrasting the most opposite things together, and strictly coordinate or ἀντίστοιχα—yet some of them in the abstract, others in the concrete. Τίς μετοχή, says he, δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀνομία; τίς δὲ κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος; ἢ τίς μερὶς πιστῶ μετὰ ἀπίστου; Here we have one abstract conception opposed to another, each to its proper correlative, considered as contraries; but all as abstract alike. But when he proceeds to subjoin, τίς δὲ συμφώνησις Χριστῶ πρὸς Βελίαρ; he opposes a real person to a real, and no longer an abstraction to an abstraction: for that Christ is an actual person, there can be no doubt, and that Beliar opposed to him, is the same, will be as little disputed, when it

is considered that in the language of St. Paul, and indeed of the Christians of the time, Beliar is but another name for Satan. The natural inference, then, from the particular language of the Angel in Daniel should be, that the Prince of the kingdom of Persia, or the Prince of Greece, must be as much an individual person and a real agent, as himself or Michael; and that if himself and Michael were not only real, but superhuman beings, the Prince of Persia and the Prince of Greece were real and superhuman beings also: for as reality in general can be properly opposed to nothing but reality in general, on the one hand; so reality of a particular kind can be properly opposed only to a corresponding reality, on the other. Tried by this rule, as a real or personal agent can have only a real or personal antagonist, and an individual personal agent only an individual personal antagonist; so a spiritual or transcendental, but personal agent, can have only a spiritual or transcendental, though personal opponent.

And as to the doctrine of tutelar or guardian angels, without venturing to express a decided opinion of my own upon it, or entering on a discussion which I consider to be foreign to the present question, I cannot help observing, that in calling it an *abominable* doctrine, the bishop has used too harsh a term; and in charging it with a direct tendency to polytheism, to idolatry, or to angel-worship, he charges it with consequences to which it is not justly liable. For it was never intended by this doctrine, as far as I understand it, to take the government of the universe out of the hands of the one great Lord and Master of all, or to transfer to the creature, however dignified and exalted, the honour which is due to the Creator. It was never intended by it to teach or inculcate the belief of any

thing, but what was presumed to be of God's own appointment, if it had any existence, and therefore to be as agreeable to his will, as consistent with his perfections, and no disparagement to his rights. The question is, after all, a question of scripture testimony, or what the word of God itself has revealed upon this subject. We know far too little of the nature and constitution of the invisible world, to undertake to pronounce of ourselves, beyond what is written, whether there is, or there is not, any foundation for the doctrine of guardian angels, intrusted with the charge of particular portions of the works of God. We may rest assured, indeed, that there is an invisible world, which has its proper inhabitants; and that those inhabitants have their proper employments; and that myriads of intelligent agents, much superior to mankind, are night and day employed on the service of the God of Sabbath, and doing his will, in a variety of ways, of which we can form no conception at present; and each, we may presume, in some appropriate manner of his own, without interfering with the same duty on the part of another. We may rest assured, that if the administration of the Divine government, and the purposes of the Divine providence, are carried on and promoted by means of instruments, and subordinate agents, in the visible world, it cannot be contrary to the Divine nature and attributes, that something like the same rule should prevail in the invisible. We may rest assured, at least, that if God is a God of order in his church, and a God of order in nature, and a God of order in the moral and civil world, he cannot be a God of disorder in the spiritual world; and that if an harmonious distribution of parts and offices, a due subordination and dependance of one thing upon another, and a general concurrence of individual functions and

individual agencies, to the good of the whole, prevail to a wonderful degree among his works upon earth ; they prevail, in all probability, much more perfectly and much more wonderfully among his creatures in heaven.

If any weight is to be allowed to the concurrent belief of Christians, especially when it can be traced back to the primitive and apostolical times of Christianity itself ; it would be easy to shew, by a production of passages from the writings of ecclesiastical men, that the persuasion of the existence not only of presiding national or tutelary, but even of individual guardian angels, prevailed in the church from a period of so remote an antiquity, that the first origin of the persuasion can with no show of reason be attributed either to Gentile or to Jewish superstition, as the bishop supposes, (neither of which, at that time, can be justly considered to have been capable of influencing the church,) nor to any thing but a kind of apostolical sanction for it, the memory of which had been preserved by tradition. It is not true, as the bishop contends, that this notion was borrowed first by the rabbis from the Gentiles ; and then by the Christians from the rabbis. We find it recognised by Christian writers, who were incapable of Gentile prejudices, and abominated in particular the whole system of pagan superstition and polytheism ; and knew nothing of rabbinical or cabbalistic traditions, which at that time had probably no existence. It is very certain, too, that whether right or wrong in itself, the Fathers who inculcate this doctrine, believed they had scriptural authority for it, in the Septuagint version of Deuteronomy xxxii. 8, to which text they most frequently appeal in confirmation of it : ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὑψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδὰμ, ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ΑΓΓΕΛΩΝ θεοῦ. The Hebrew indeed has a very different reading,

which is faithfully expressed in our English Bibles. But admit the Septuagint reading—and the doctrine of presiding or tutelar angels would seem to flow out of it without much straining to the obvious meaning of the text.

It must be confessed, indeed, that whatever opinion we may form of the particular nature or particular employment of these two beings, who are described in the present instance, the one as the Prince of the kingdom of Persia, the other as the Prince of Javan or Greece ; the manner in which they are spoken of, and the peculiar designation which is given them, as Archons or Princes, is scriptural at least, and has the sanction not only of the Old Testament in this instance, and in the instance considered from Ezekiel, but also of the New. For both St. Paul and St. Peter have taught us, that the regular phraseology of scripture in speaking of the angels, collectively, is with such denominations as these—under styles and titles denoting power and mastery, empire and supremacy, of some kind or another—thrones, (*θρόνοι*,) principalities, (*κυριότητες*,) rules, (*ἀρχαὶ*,) authorities, (*ἐξουσίαι*,) powers, (*δυνάμεις*,) or the like : see Romans viii. 38 : Ephesians i. 21 : iii. 10 : Colossians i. 15, 16 : 1 Peter iii. 22. They have taught us, also, that though the angels are distinguished into good and bad, this peculiar phraseology in speaking of them is not confined to the good ; the same high-sounding styles and titles are equally applied to the bad : see Ephesians vi. 12 : 1 Cor. viii. 5 : xv. 24 : Coloss. ii. 15 : from which we might justly infer, they were the common right of both, or so inherent in the angelic nature, that they could not be separated from it, even by the effects of the fall. The angels were essentially ruling and governing, or ar-

chon, Principles; so essentially, that they could not cease to be so, even after the fall.

But the truth is, as it appears to me, the doctrine of tutelary angels, properly so called, and understood in that sense in which the bishop endeavours to confute it—which is the doctrine of created spirits, of a kind superior to human, but good, delegated and deputed by the Supreme Being to have the charge of particular countries, or particular portions of mankind—is not concerned in the solution of this present question. For, as far as I can see my way by the light of scripture, through what is confessedly a mysterious and doubtful subject, I think there is reason to come to the conclusion, that the notion of archon, or ruling spirits, as far as regards our own world more especially—having power, dominion, or jurisdiction over particular nations or countries, with the exception of the Jews under the old dispensation, and of Christians under the new, is not to be indiscriminately applied to the angels, but to be confined to the evil angels in particular. Bishop Horsley (p. 377) adverts to the possibility that the Prince of Persia and the Prince of Grecia might be angels of this description; but then, he contends, they could not in that case be tutelar angels of Greece or Persia, or of any other country. And while I allow him his conclusion, that no evil angel could be a tutelar angel, (which would be a contradiction in terms,) still, if there is any foundation for the opinion which I have just expressed, it will not follow that an evil angel, though no tutelar angel, might not be an archon or ruling angel.

To enter at large upon the reasons which have induced me to form this opinion, would take up too much time, and would require the review of too many texts

of scripture, to be at present attempted. I can only refer to them in a general manner; which, perhaps, will not be considered to do them justice: but this I will venture to say, that if the reader of scripture, and of the New Testament in particular, will take this persuasion along with him, he will find it throw a wonderful light upon many obscure passages of Holy Writ, as well as greatly illustrate the scheme of human redemption in general.

Now, I think, this mystery or secret of the angelic world, if I may so call it, is intimated in the allusion to the fallen angels at Jude 6: which the Bible translation has rendered, “The Angels that kept not their first estate;” but which would more properly have been rendered, “The Angels, that kept not their own dominion”—for the words of the Greek are, Ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν—where though ἀρχή may denote beginning, it may also denote dominion; and though τηρῆσαι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν may well be rendered, to keep their own dominion, it cannot properly be rendered, to keep their own beginning—which would be just as unnatural a mode of speaking in Greek as in English. Our translators appear to have been sensible of this, when, while they rendered τηρῆσαι by keeping, its natural sense, they softened and qualified the proper sense of ἀρχή, by what they considered equivalent to beginning; viz. first estate: which however was not to render, but to paraphrase, the Greek. To keep their first estate might be an allowable phrase in our language; but to keep their beginning was scarcely so.

We find the Tempter, in the presence of our Lord himself, and at the time of the third temptation, when he could not but know the truth of his character and relation as the Son of the Most High God; claiming to him-

self the disposal of the kingdoms of the world, and the right of giving them to whom he would ; Matt. iv. 9. Luke iv. 6: and we do not find our Saviour denying this right, or disallowing this claim ; from which we cannot but conclude, I think, that it must have been true in some sense or other—which would argue that he was so far the Lord of the world in the strictest sense of the term : particularly too, as he uses such language in speaking of this right, as not to imply that he claimed it absolutely as his own, as derived and held from himself, but as received in trust, as something which had been committed to him by another ; ὅτι ἐμοὶ ΠΑΡΑΔΕΔΟΤΑΙ (sc. ἡ ἐξουσία αὕτη ἅπαντα) καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν θέλω δίδωμι αὐτήν.

We find our Saviour on three several occasions describing this Being, as the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου : John xii. 31. xiv. 30. xvi. 11. We find St. Paul applying the title of archons or rulers of this world, to this Being and his angels generally ; 1 Cor. ii. 6. and 8. We find the same apostle designating this Being in particular, as the God τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου : 2 Cor. iv. 3. 4. We find the same apostle designating him as the archon of the authority of the air ; Ephesians ii. 2: which is but another way of speaking for the archon τῶν ἐξουσιῶν τῶν ἀερίων : where while the epithet, aerial, will describe the seat of their abode, or locality of their residence, so the appellative, ἐξουσίαι, the abstract being put for the concrete, will describe the capacity in which they are supposed to reside and to dwell there collectively ; viz. in the relation of rulers and superiors of some kind, and with some jurisdiction or other, which is most naturally to be presumed to be that of this lower world, of which the air itself forms a part. We find the same apostle, describing this Being and his angels collectively, Ephesians vi. 12, not only as πνευματικὰ

τῆς πονηρίας, which defines their nature, or what they are in themselves, but as ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουσίαι, which implies their relation to other things, as governing or authority-having principles in general; and as the κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, which describes their relation to this world in the same capacity in particular, and under a compound designation is equivalent to ἄρχοντες τοῦ κόσμου, used of them, to express the same relation before.

It would be easy to multiply testimonies to the same effect, directly or indirectly, from other passages of scripture. But these are sufficient to shew what the established language of sacred writ is, in speaking of the Devil and his angels, more especially with reference to this present world and this present state of things, in connection with which alone we know any thing of them, or have any interest in their being and agency: viz. as beings or principles, whose specific relation to this world is that of ἄρχοντες, ἐξουσίαι, κυριότητες—whose jurisdiction over it is limited in one respect, and one only—archons, authorities, rulers, and governors of this part of the world, whose power and supremacy extend over all but the people of God as such—the Jews under the Mosaic dispensation, and the Christians under the Gospel.

Now this being the case, it is certainly in unison with that mode of speaking, that the archon of the kingdom of Persia, and the archon of Greece, should be mentioned in the Book of Daniel, and the archon of Tyre in the Book of Ezekiel; and all three as co-ordinate powers or rulers of this description—or the two former as subordinate powers, belonging to the number in general, and the last of them, to judge from the terms in which he is spoken of, which are much too magnificent to apply in strict propriety to any but

the most exalted among them, very possibly as the chief of all, as the head of those powers and rulers in particular. It is in unison with it, too, that while Persia and Greece have each their ruler or archon, and each one opposed to the angel Gabriel, and to his labours for the good of Daniel and of his people; this people, too, have their archon or ruler in the person of Michael, “the prince of princes,” or archon of archons, (viii. 25.)—one of the chief, the first, or the capital archons or princes, (x. 13.)—the great archon or prince, (xii. 1.) who holds with Gabriel in this capacity, in behalf of his people, who stands up for them, in the last extremity, who fights with those that fight against them, and treats all as the enemies of himself, who are the enemies of them.

I have thought it necessary to say thus much, to vindicate the literal construction of the text of Daniel in this present instance; especially against so formidable an authority as the name of bishop Horsley. But as to pretending to explain in what way the parties concerned in this reciprocal warfare, the Prince of Persia and the Prince of Greece on the one hand, and the angel Gabriel, and Michael their prince on the other, discharged their respective parts, the one in opposing and thwarting, the other in abetting and promoting, the counsels of God for the good of his people—it would be to presume to be wise beyond what is written, were we to attempt to do that. It would be to pry into secrets, which are inaccessible to the eyes of flesh. Spiritual enemies must carry on a spiritual warfare; and a spiritual warfare must be maintained with spiritual weapons, and by spiritual modes of attack or defence: concerning which we can know or conceive but little at present. The influence of spirits indeed upon agents of a different description, may be called into ac-

tion in the course of such a contest, on both sides : and though spirits as spirits cannot contend carnally like flesh and blood, yet they may stir up the arms of flesh and blood, they may work upon human passions, and by human passions, in cooperation with themselves, and make the free agency of men instrumental to their own proper purposes, whatsoever they be. And this, which Scripture would teach us to believe, is the rule of proceeding where spiritual agents are concerned in conjunction with human, in other instances, there is no reason to suppose might not have been the case in the present instance : nor consequently, why one mode, in which the Prince of Persia might have carried on his hostility against Gabriel and Michael to the prejudice of the people of Daniel, might not have been, what bishop Horsley supposes, the stirring up enemies against them in the court of Persia ; and so impeding and delaying the final restitution and settlement of the country : which indeed appears to have been more or less the effect, by whatever means brought to pass, from the time of Cyrus to that of Nehemiah, through a period of nearly ninety years.

As to the further question, what particular reason there might be, why the Prince of Javan or Greece also should be described as making common cause with the Prince of Persia, in the third of Cyrus, against Gabriel and Michael ; that too is one of the secrets of Satan's kingdom, and of the mode of its administration at present, about which we are not competent to give an opinion. We may, however, presume, that among the various members of such a kingdom and under such an head, it is reasonable to suppose there should be the closest union of purpose, and sympathy of feeling ; and that as to Greece and Persia in particular, they were countries especially conjoined in the counsels of the Di-

vine Providence, and in the future destinies of the world, as well as of the Jewish or Christian church ; the Persian empire being to be succeeded by the Grecian, and the Grecian to exercise a considerable influence both for good and for bad, first over the fortunes of the Jewish church, and ultimately over those of the Christian ; if, as it would appear from the prophecies of Daniel themselves, Antichrist, the great persecutor of the church of Christ, and antagonist of Christ himself, yet to come, is destined to arise out of that part of the world which was once subject to the empire of the Greeks, and which must be still considered, if any part of the world can still be considered, to represent the Grecian empire itself. And lastly, we may observe that if the true political situation of Persia and Greece, relative to each other, in the third of Cyrus, B. C. 534, were fully known ; it is not improbable it would actually be found to throw light upon the reasons of this connection of the mention of Greece and Persia, in the tenth chapter of Daniel, with that period in particular.

I shall conclude these observations, then, with one or two more remarks ; which will complete what I have to say on the chronology of the Book of Daniel.

The prophet Daniel was brought away captive from Judæa in the third or fourth of Jehoiachim, B. C. 606. At that time he is called a child ; but the Hebrew idiom applies the name of child, at any time of life under the age of manhood ; and it is morally certain, that when Daniel was appointed ruler of the province of Babylon, and chief of the governors over all the wise men in Babylon, (that is, as bishop Horsley expresses it, president of the college of Magi,) in the second of Nebuchadnezzar, ii. 1. 48, only three or four years after his arrival in Babylon, he was nearer thirty than twenty years of age. Let us suppose him however to

have been only twenty, in the second of Nebuchadnezzar, B. C. 603. He would be eighty-nine in the third of Cyrus, B. C. 534. That he did not accompany the Jews on their return to Judæa, B. C. 536, is certain; and that one reason of this might be his advanced age at the time, is not improbable. Yet we may justly presume that the return itself, at the precise period marked out by prophecy, in the first of Cyrus, might be due in part to the station of Daniel in the court of Persia, to his reputation in the reign of Darius, before Cyrus' accession, and to his influence with Cyrus himself; the language of whose proclamation or decree, giving permission to the Jews to return, is such, as could scarcely have been dictated by any but Daniel himself*. See 2 Chron. xxxvi. 23: Ezra i. 2, 3.

If the age of Daniel was more than twenty, B. C.

* Josephus relates, Ant. x. xi. 7, that after the accession of Darius the Mede, and the deliverance of Daniel, recorded in chapter v. the latter built a tower or *βάρις*, at Ecbatana in Media, of wonderful art and beauty; which still existed in his own time, and had been used ever after as the regal sepulchre of the kings of Media, Persia, and Parthia, successively; and from the first was specially confided to the keeping of a Jewish priest.

I know not on what authority this statement is made. But it is a singular coincidence, that, according to the Book of Ezra, vi. 2, when search was commanded to be made in the second of Darius, B. C. 521, for the original record of the permission of Cyrus to the Jews to return—a roll was found, it is

said, at Achmetha, in the palace, that is in the province of the Medes, containing the decree in question. The Septuagint renders this, ἐν Ἑκβαράνοισι τῇ βάρει τῇ ἐν Μηδείᾳ χώρᾳ: and Josephus recognises the antiquity of this reading by transferring the same statement to his Antiquities, xi: iv. 6. καὶ εὐρέθη ἐν Ἑκβαράνοισι, τῇ βάρει τῇ ἐν Μηδίᾳ, βιβλίον, κ', τ. λ. If this was the original roll, and kept in a *βάρις* or tower at Ecbatana, it would go far to authenticate the tradition that Daniel built a *βάρις* there; and that this was the tower in question. It must be observed, however, that the word in the Hebrew, which answers to the Greek, does not properly denote a citadel, or tower, in that language, but a palace: not *arx* or *turris*, but *regia*.

603, he would be proportionally older, B.C. 534, at the date of the last of his visions. In the natural course of things, it cannot be supposed that he would long survive his ninetieth year and upwards. And if we were to conjecture that he died soon after the date of this vision, we should have apparently the countenance of the last words of this prophecy itself; which are such as almost to intimate that the time of his death was at hand. Ch. xii. 9. “And he said, Go thy way, Daniel; for the words *are* closed up and sealed till the time of the end.” And again, xii. 13: “But go thou thy way till the end *be*: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.” In this case, the absolute length of time embraced by the Book of Daniel, will be from B.C. 606, to B.C. 534: or seventy-two years in all.

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION XIII.

Further Consideration of the Opinions of the most ancient Christians upon the preceding topics.

Vide Dissertation xiii. vol. i. page 451. line 8—465. last line.

JUSTIN MARTYR—The date which Cassiodorus assigns to the presentation of the first Apology of Justin Martyr, is confirmed by the further testimony of Prosper of Aquitaine; who places it in Chronico^a, U.C. 899. That this year was the date of the consulate of Clarus and Severus, may likewise be shewn by the following coincidence.

The emperor Severus was born vi (*corr.* iii.) Ides of April (April 11.) Coss. Erucio Claro ii. et Severo^b. Dio agrees with Spartian as to the day of his birth^c; but he makes him at the time of his death to be sixty-five years, nine months, and twenty-five days old. Spartian, on the contrary, as his text stands uncorrected, tells us he did not live one year more than eighty-nine years^d; a manifest error in the statement or reading. The truth is, as he died early in the month of February, (Feb. 4,) U. C. 964, Dio meant to say that he was sixty-four years, nine months, and twenty-five days old; and had he survived to the eleventh of April, he would have been sixty-five complete. In this case, his birthday was April 11, U. C. 899, which was consequently the year of the consulate of Clarus and Severus.

If we institute a search for notes of time, into the

^a Operum 712. ^b Spartian, Severus, 1. ^c lxxvi. 17. ^d Vita, 22.
Yet Pescennius Niger, 5. the same statement is repeated.

Apology of Justin itself; it must be acknowledged that none occurs there, which is very distinct and definite: yet what there are rather favour the supposition that it was presented early in the reign of Antoninus, than the contrary. With respect to the persons, addressed in the opening sentence, Titus Ælius Hadrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Cæsar, or emperor, and Verissimus his son the Philosopher, and Lucius the Philosopher, the son of Cæsar by nature, and of Pius by adoption; all the difficulty respecting them is done away, if by the Cæsar who is spoken of as naturally the father of Lucius, we understand L. Ælius Verus Cæsar, *deceased*; whom Hadrian adopted about U. C. 889 or 890, and upon his death, January 1, U. C. 891^e, adopted Antoninus Pius; on condition that Antoninus Pius himself should adopt Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; the former the son of Annius Verus, the brother of Annia Galeria Faustina, the wife of Antoninus Pius; the latter the son of Ælius Verus Cæsar, deceased. Such is the true account of these several adoptions; as it might be proved from the testimony of contemporary writers, Aristides, Galen, Dio, and others *: though Capitolinus in his Life of Marcus Antoninus Philosophus, and of Verus Imperator^f, supposes Marcus adopted by Pius, and Verus by Marcus. But Spartian in his Life of Hadrian^g, if not of

* To these we may add Marcus Antoninus himself, De Rebus suis, i. 14. 17, and apud Frontonis Opera Inedita, Epp. ad Marcum Cæsarem, i. 5: the emperor Julian, in Cæsaribus, Operum 312. A: ἐπισελεύσεως δὲ αὐτῷ τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν ξυνωρίδος,

Βήρου καὶ Λουκίου, κ', τ. λ; Zosimus, lib. i. ἡ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ξυνωρίς, Βῆρος καὶ Λούκιος: Aurelius Victor, De Marco: Ammianus Marcellinus, xxvii. 6: and the Letters of Verus and Fronto, *e libro citato*: Ep. 3. p. 85: 4. p. 87, 89: 6. p. 96: 7. p. 96, 97.

^e Vide the coins of Sinope, Eckhel, ii. 393. and Spartian, Hadrianus, 26. 1. ^f Antoninus, 5. Verus, 2. Cf. however, Antoninus, 7. Verus, 3. ^g 24. Cf. also Severus, 20. Verus Cæsar, 5, 6, 7. Capitolinus, Antoninus Pius, 4.

Ælius Verus Cæsar, and Capitolinus himself in that of Antoninus Pius, are more agreeable to the truth. The precise year of this double adoption may be uncertain, whether U. C. 891 or 892^h. The coins of Marcus Aurelius, as Cæsar, appear first, U. C. 892ⁱ.

The name of Verissimus, by which Marcus is designated in the above passage, was given to him by Hadrian before he assumed the toga virilis^{k*}; which he did, U. C. 888, in his fifteenth year^l. And though after that assumption, Hadrian is said to have called him Annius Verus; yet there is extant a coin of Tyra, a city of Sarmatia Europæa, which has upon it the head of M. Aurelius, and the name Verissimus Cæsar^m; consequently after the time of his adoption itself, U. C. 892.

At the end of the Apology, Hadrian's rescript to Minucius Fundanus is quoted, and given at full lengthⁿ: a rescript, which Jerome, in *Chronico*, dates in the tenth of Hadrian, and Eusebius, *Chronicon Armeno-Latinum*, in the eighth. In one passage, we have a general allusion to some existing law against castration^o—which Domitian, Nerva^p, and Hadrian, each at different times forbade: in another to the death and deification of Antinous, spoken of as τοῦ νῦν γεγενημένου^q, the time of which, as I shall have occasion to prove hereafter, came between the eleventh and the

* Dio or Xiphilinus, lxi. 21. implies that he gave him the name when he caused him to be adopted by Antoninus. According to Herodian, i. 1, the name of Verissimus was given to one of Marcus' sons—Annius Verus,

as I should suppose—no mention being made of any other son of Marcus, but this one so named, and Commodus. Marcus is called Verissimus Cæsar, by Jerome, in *Chronico*, ad annum Abrahami 2162. Antonini Pii ix.

^h See Capitolinus, Antoninus Ph. i. 5. 7. ⁱ Eckhel, vii. 44. ^k Capitolinus, Vita, i. 4. ^l Ibid. ^m Eckhel, ii. 4. ⁿ Page 99. line 13—100. l. 23. ^o P. 47. l. 6—14. ^p Cf. Dio, lxxvii. 2. lxxviii. 2: Cassiodorus, *Chronica*, the first of Domitian: Ammianus Marcellinus, xviii. 4: Eusebius and Jerome, *Chronica*, ad annum Abrahami 2098 or 2099. ^q P. 47. l. 19.

fifteenth of Hadrian : in other passages, to the Jewish war, &c. Barchochab's persecution of the Christians ; the destruction of Jerusalem ; and the consequences of the war to the Jews ; all as still recent events ^r. That war was brought to a close U. C. 888, or 889.

In other passages, the heretic Marcion of Pontus is spoken of as still living, and still disseminating his doctrines, when Justin was writing the Apology^s. He speaks also of a work of his own against all the heresies, which up to that time had appeared in the Christian world, to which he refers the emperors^t. That Marcion's heresy was included among the rest, may very probably be collected both from the title of the work, and because Justin's treatise against Marcion is quoted *ρητῶς* by Irenæus^u.

The precise time of the rise of the heresy of Marcion, may be doubtful ; further than that the most ancient authorities make it contemporary with the reign of Antoninus Pius, and with the bishopric of Hyginus, whom Eusebius^w places in the first of Antoninus, and supposes to have sat only four years. Tertullian, *Contra Marcionem* ^x, i. 19, says indeed : *Quoto quidem anno Antonini Majoris de Ponto suo exhalaverit aura canicularis, non curavi investigare : de quo tamen constat, Antoninianus hæreticus est, sub Pio impius*^y. Yet just before he says : *Anno xv. Tiberii Christus Jesus de coelo manare dignatus est, spiritus salutaris ; Marcionis salutis, qui ita voluit : (where he is speaking according*

^r P. 49. l. 27 : 70. 31—71. 8 : 78. 15. ^s P. 43. l. 1 : 85. 15—30. Cf. Eusebius, E. H. iv. 11. 125. B. ^t P. 44. 1. ^u Lib. iv. xiv. 300. 14. Cf. v. xxvi. 441. 21. which Eusebius, E. H. iv. 18. 141. A. shews to be a quotation from it also. Vide also Tertullian, *Operum* ii. 149. *Adversus Valentinianos*, 5 : Hieronymus, de SS. Ecclesiasticis, cap. 23 : Photius, *Bibl. Codex* 125. ^w E. H. iv. 10. 11. 125. A. ^x *Operum* i. 33. ^y Cf. Irenæus, i. xxviii. 103. xxix. 104 : iii. iii. 204 : iv. 206. l. 9 : Clemens Alex. ii. 898. Strom. vii. 17 : Cyprian, *Operum* 211. Ep. lxxiv. Cf. Ep. lxxv. p. 219 : Epiphanius, i. 299. C : 303. D. 364. C. D : Theodorit, *Operum* iv. 314. *Hæreticarum Fabularum* i. xxiv : Eusebius and Jerome, *Chronica*, ad annum Abrahami 2156. Antonini Pii iii.

to the opinions of Marcion ; as we learn from lib. iv. 7. p. 197: Anno quintodecimo principatus Tiberii, proponit eum descendisse in civitatem Galilææ Capharnaum: which was probably the beginning of St. Luke's Gospel according to Marcion.) Immediately after, he continues: A Tiberio autem usque ad Antoninum anni fere CXV et dimidium anni, cum dimidio mensis: tantumdem temporis ponunt inter Christum et Marcionem.

I think this computation is intended to bear date from Tiberii xv. U. C. 781–782, the time of the manifestation of Christ according to Marcion ; in which case, 116 current years bring us to U. C. 896–897: as the age most probably intended by Tertullian for Marcion himself. For, as this interval of time cannot possibly hold good between the beginning of the reign of Tiberius and that of Antoninus Pius; nor between the close of the one, and the beginning or the end of the other, respectively—of what must it be understood, if not of the manifestation of the Christ on the one hand, and the appearance of Marcion on the other? On this principle, there would still be time for Justin to have written against Marcion, though he presented his Apology U. C. 899: especially as the doctrines of Marcion were broached at Rome, where the Apology was presented*, and where, according to Epiphanius, *loc. cit.* Marcion became the disciple of Cerdo, immediately after Hyginus' death, which Eusebius places U. C. 895.†

* For some more particulars concerning Marcion, see Tertullian, *Operum* ii. 35. De Præscriptione Hæreticorum, p. 30. It is however to be observed, that Jerome, De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, *loco citato*, distinguishes the work against Marcion from that against heresies in general.

There is no reason, therefore, why the former might not have been written after the latter.

† Both Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, and Jerome, De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, mention a multitude of writers against Marcion; the time of all of whom accords to the suppo-

In the second Apology of Justin, as it is commonly called, there are fewer notes of time than in the first. Jerome, and Photius, speak of this as presented to the successors of Antoninus Pius, which means, to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus^z: but Justin himself, in one passage of it^a, apostrophizes the reigning emperor, in the second person; and consequently shews it to be some *one* person, in particular, who was king, even though others in some sense might be associated with him: in which case the Apology was presented either to Antoninus Pius, or to Marcus Aurelius after the death of Verus; that is, not before the ninth or tenth year of his reign*.

There is no allusion in this second Apology, to the first; which may justly be considered surprising if it was really written after it: for we find Justin referring in the Dialogus, (a work which was probably composed in the reign of Hadrian^b), to some address of his, which had been presented to the reigning emperor—who in that case must have been Hadrian; in which he had not spared his own countrymen the Samaritans^c. I should be disposed to believe that this Apo-

sition that the heresy in question first appeared under Antoninus Pius. These writers flourished principally in the reign of his successor, the first of them, next to Justin Martyr, being Theophilus bishop of Antioch. The heretic Marcion was known to Celsus the Epicurean; the date of whose work, answered by Origen, was early in the reign of Antoninus Pius. The anecdote

recorded by Irenæus, of Polycarp and him, if true, proves that Marcion's heresy was older than Polycarp's martyrdom, A. D. 164, and probably than his visit to Rome, under Anicetus. Irenæus, iii. cap. iii. 204, &c.

* Eusebius, E. H. iv. 18. 140. A. accordingly supposes it to be addressed to Antoninus Verus, the successor of Antoninus Pius.

^z Photius, Codex 125. p. 94. Hieronymus, Operum iv. pars ii^a. 110. De SS. Ecclesiasticis, 23. Cf. 656. *ad principium*. ^a P. 109. l. 3. ^b Cf. Pars i^a. 137. 21. 155. 6. 169. 2. Add to which, that, 153. 3. 436. 32. the work is dedicated to Marcus Pompeius; whom Grabe conjectures to be the same Marcus who was the first Gentile bishop of Jerusalem; that is, *after* the close of the Jewish war. See Eusebius, E. H. iv. 6. 119. A. v. 12. 176. D. ^c Page 397. 4.

logy, though commonly considered the second, was in reality something prior to the former. It is, as we now possess it, manifestly an imperfect production; the beginning of which has been lost, though the conclusion is probably entire. And there is at the end of it a very significant allusion to Antoninus Pius, and his two sons—both of whom the first Apology designates by the title of Philosophers; which is sufficient to prove, that these three were reigning in conjunction at the time of this address, as well as at that of the former: εἴη οὖν καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀξίως Εὐσεβείας καὶ Φιλοσοφίας τὰ δίκαια ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν κρίναι^d. A plurality of rulers, too, is implied in the following passage, just before: καὶ ὑμᾶς οὖν ἀξιοῦμεν ὑπογράψαντας τὸ ὑμῖν δοκοῦν προθεῖναι τουτὶ τὸ βιβλίδιον^e: notwithstanding which, some *one* of them might still be addressed as the supreme governor, or emperor as such; which is the case in the passage referred to above*.

There is mention made in this treatise of Musonius the philosopher, ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς^f; that is, as a contemporary of the writer's: which can scarcely be understood of the philosopher of that name, whom Tacitus, Philostratus, Suidas, and others †, prove to have

* If, indeed, this second Apology was written soon after the matter of fact happened, which gave occasion to it, (see 106. i. sqq.) then 110. 21–25. in the course of that narrative, seems clearly to recognise Antoninus Pius, as the reigning emperor; and only one other person as associated in the mention with him, whom it calls φιλοσόφου or φιλοσόφου Καίσαρος παιδί. This must be M. Aurelius as such: whether before or after he was invested with the tribunitia po-

testas, may be doubtful. Why should not this second apology, as it is called, have been written and presented to Antoninus Pius, about the fourth of his reign, U. C. 894, where Eusebius and Jerome, in *Chronico*, place the first? and the first about the ninth, U. C. 899. where Cassiodorus places it?

† Cf. Dio, lxxvi. 13. Pliny, Epp. iii. 11. vii. 31. (which together ascertain his name to have been C. Musonius Bassus; though Jerome, *Chronicon*, ad

flourished in the reigns of Nero and Vespasian*. But Origen also contra Celsum^g, speaks of a Musonius, whom he describes as one τῶν χθὲς καὶ πρώην γεγονότων : who was, most probably, this contemporary of Justin's†. The Apology begins with an abrupt reference

Titii ii. calls him Musonius Rufus. So Dio lxii. 27.)—Julian Opera, 265. C. D. ad Themistium: Eusebius and Jerome in Chronico: Eunapius, vitæ Sophistarum, Proœmium, p. 3. The sect which this Musonius followed was the Cynic.

* Suidas, voce Κορνούτος, in his account of Cornutus the philosopher of Leptis in Africa, says he was put to death by Nero, along with the abovementioned Musonius; and he repeats this statement of Musonius' being put to death by Nero, under Μουσώνιος. But the truth is, that Nero did not put either Cornutus or Musonius, his contemporary, to death, but only banished them, see Dio, lxii. 27, and 29. and Jerome, Chronicon, 162, ad Neronis xiv: as might be collected indeed from Suidas' very account, in the extract from Julian, in the last of these instances. The same conclusion would follow from the history of Cornutus, in conjunction with that of Persius, the satirist, whose preceptor he was: see Satira v. Suidas, voce Πωλίων, Asinius Pollio, whose acme is placed in the time of Pompey the Great, is yet made a contemporary of Musonius the philosopher, if not later than he: the former of which is barely possible, but the latter is impossible. Another Pollio, however, is mentioned directly after.

† Philostratus, in his Life of Herodes Atticus, Vitæ Sophistarum ii. 555. B. mentions Mu-

sonius the Tyrian, as the preceptor of Lucius, the philosopher, one of the contemporaries and friends of Herodes; who must have been contemporary with Justin. Aristides, also, Ἱερῶν λόγων 5'. Oratio xxviii. 551. mentions a Musonius, apparently as one of his contemporaries—who was probably the same person.

It appears in fact from Suidas, Ἑρμογένης, that Hermogenes of Tarsus was the preceptor of a Musonius, the philosopher, who must have been contemporary with the emperor Marcus, because Marcus himself also was among the hearers of Hermogenes; who yet, it appears, could have had no hearers or disciples after he was twenty-five years of age. Cf. the Vitæ Sophistarum of Philostratus, ii. 575. Hermogenes,—from whom Suidas quotes his account of the Hermogenes in question. We may conclude that this Musonius was Musonius the Tyrian, as well as the contemporary of Justin. The Musonius mentioned by Eunapius, Vitæ Sophistarum, 92. Proæresius, as a contemporary of Proæresius, must have been a totally different person. Of this Musonius, also, see Suidas, in Μουσώνιος, and Valesius, ad Ammianum Marcellinum, xxvii. 9: whence it appears that the date of his death was A. D. 368, in the reign of Valentinian the First.

Jerome

to a fact which had happened under the mayoralty of Urbicus, not long before^b, *χθὲς δὲ καὶ πρῶην*. At what time any Urbicus was Urbis Præfectus unfortunately is not exactly known*. A Lollius Urbicus is spoken

Jerome in *Chronico*, places the acme of a writer (whom he calls Musanus, and Eusebius' *Chronicon Armeno-Latinum* Musianus, and Syncellus *Μουσικανός*, i. 670. 1.) in the twelfth of Severus. His true name indeed was Musanus. But he was a Christian writer, not a Gentile philosopher; and besides would be too late for Justin Martyr, were it not that Jerome, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, xxxi. *Operum* iv. Pars i^a. 111, enumerates him among those who wrote against the Encratitæ, or followers of Tatian, (a disciple of Justin:) sub Imperatore M. Antonino Vero. Cf. Eusebius, *E. H.* iv. 21. 28: and Theodorit, *Hæreticarum Fabularum* i. 21. *Operum* iv. 313. His acme, according to these testimonies, would certainly be the reign of M. Aurelius, Commodus, or Severus. The Musonius, contemporary of Nero and Vespasian, or the Musonius, who flourished in the reign of M. Aurelius, is most probably the one alluded to by name, in Himerius, *Oratio* xxiii. §. 21. p. 802.

* The name of Lollius Urbicus, as Urbis Præfectus, or mayor of the city of Rome, occurs in the extant *Oratio* of Apuleius, *De Magia*, (*Opera*, vol. ii. p. 5.) and he is spoken of there as V. C. Vir Consularis, also, at the time when that oration was delivered.

It would take up too much

time, and after all would probably prove a very uninteresting discussion to the reader, were I to enter upon a detailed analysis of this speech. It is sufficient to observe, respecting it, that it was delivered by Apuleius in answer to the charge of having gained the affections of one Pudentilla, a rich widow, of Cæa in Africa, by magical charms and incantations, and so persuaded her to marry him. The time of this marriage, it might be made to appear, was the year after Apuleius' coming to Cæa, on his way to Alexandria; Pudentilla having then been thirteen years complete a widow; and being about forty years of age. The proconsul of Africa, at the time of the marriage, was Lollianus Avitus; and Apuleius was *once* heard before this proconsul, upon the charge preferred against him by the surviving relations of Pudentilla's first husband—at Carthage—a short time after his marriage; consequently in the same year with that event. The extant *Oratio de Magia* was delivered at a second hearing of the same accusation and defence, before Claudius Maximus, who it seems succeeded Lollianus Avitus in the proconsulate. This it appears was in the third year, since Apuleius first arrived at Cæa; consequently, it was in the year after his marriage; and Claudius Maximus must have followed Avitus directly in the

of by Capitolinus, as Antoninus' legate in Britainⁱ, during a war which does not appear to have extended

government of Africa. That the proconsulate of Africa was an annual office at this time appears further from the Florida of Apuleius, vol. ii. 123, 124.

Whether Claudius Maximus here mentioned is the same person with Gavius Maximus, præfectus prætorii under Antoninus Pius, according to Capitolinus, (Vita, 8.) is doubtful; especially as this last is said to have been twenty years in office as præfectus prætorii, under Antoninus Pius. The name of Cavius Maximus occurs in Frontonis Opera inedita, Epp. ad Antoninum, iv. pars i. p. 10, and a letter to Lollianus Avitus, ibid. 131. Epp. ad Amicos, ii. Avitus and Maximus, however, who thus succeeded each other in the proconsulate of Africa, it seems from the Fasti Consulares were consuls *ordinarii* together U. C. 897. A. D. 144. in the seventh of Antoninus Pius. It appears too from the oration that they were personal friends. How long after their consulate the first of them was in office as proconsul, is matter of uncertainty. The oration before Maximus was pronounced when Pius was still emperor; as appears from an allusion to his statue, before which the proceedings took place. Anciently, we know that the usual interval between the consulate and the proconsulate was five or six years at least; and it could scarcely be less at this time of day. If so, Avitus was probably not in office before U. C. 904 or 905 at least.

It is not easy to ascertain the precise interval of time which would probably intervene between the consulate and proconsulate in a given instance. It was liable to vary, and doubtless did vary, at different periods of Roman history. I should be inclined, however, to think that as it had once been five or six, it was now about seven or eight years. We may arrive at this conclusion on probable grounds as follows.

In Tacitus' Life of Agricola, cap. 42. an allusion occurs to the time, when, in the due course of things, Agricola who was consul U. C. 830, (cap. 9. and vide the Fasti Consulares) Proconsulatum....sortiretur. This time may not be exactly defined; but it seems it was later or not earlier than the date of Agricola's return from Britain, U. C. 838 or 839. (see capp. 9. 18. 20-25. 28-33. 39, 40.) and from cap. 45, we may infer it was not less than four years before Agricola's death, which (cap. 44.) bore date U. C. 846. For my own part, I should apprehend that the time in question was this very year of Agricola's return, U. C. 838: and that one reason of his resigning the command in Britain, was that he might *Ex more provinciam sortiri*, by returning home. The life of Agricola is not very exact in point of chronology. The context of capp. 41, 42. compared with Dio, lvii. and Suetonius' Domitian, will imply that the year of the sortitio in question

ⁱ Vita, 5.

beyond the third year of his reign^k. An Orphitus is mentioned as præfect sometime under the same empe-

was as probably U. C. 838, as any. If so, Agricola's turn for the proconsulate either was, or should have been, just eight years after the expiration of his consulate.

The same conclusion may be generally inferred from Herodian vii. 10: where it appears that Gordian the elder was proconsul of Africa, A. D. 237. The *Fasti* shew that he was consul suff. once *ex kalendis Martiis* A. D. 213, and again, A. D. 229. If so, he was serving the office of proconsul in Africa, either twenty-four years after his first consulate, or eight years after his second; the latter of which is much the more probable supposition: Cf. *Capitolinus*, *Gordianus*, 2. 4. 5. In any case, he was serving the office of proconsul a certain number of years, eight or a multiple of eight, after the date of his consulate.

The same rule existed in the time of Nero. Marcus Junius Silanus was serving the office of proconsul of Asia, post consulatum, U. C. 807, when he was poisoned by order of Agrippina immediately after Nero's accession: Oct. 13. U. C. 807. *Pliny*, *H. N.* vii. 11. *Tacitus*, *Annales*, xiii. 1. Now M. Junius Silanus was consul ordinarius, U. C. 799, whence to U. C. 807, is just eight years, exclusive of the year of the consulate.

Avitus' year of office coincided, as it appeared, with the date of Apuleius' marriage, as that of Maximus did with the date of his extant oration, *de Magia*.

Before this oration was delivered, the principal party in bringing forward the accusation against which it is directed, Sicinius Æmilianus, (a brother in law of Pudentilla, that is, the brother of her former husband,) is charged by Apuleius with having attempted to set aside the will of his avunculus, or maternal uncle, at Rome, on the pretence of forgery; the cause having been heard and determined before Lollius Urbicus, at that time *urbis præfectus*.

This allusion certainly proves the mayoralty of Urbicus to have come before the proconsulate of Maximus, and we may justly presume of Avitus; but how long, appears uncertain. I cannot help thinking, however, that as the son of Pudentilla, Pontianus, (whose name is often mentioned in the course of this oration, first as the personal friend and acquaintance of Apuleius, by whose advice and entreaty he was persuaded to marry his mother, and then, as one of his adversaries or accusers, who took part in the charge against him,) appears to have been at Rome at the very time when Pudentilla, his mother, in the fourteenth year of her widowhood, had conceived the determination of marrying again, (as it is supposed, because her health required it,) and was summoned thence by a letter of his mother to Cæa; he was there upon this business, connected with the will of his mother's brother in law's maternal uncle.

^k Eckhel, vii. 14. Cf. *Capitolinus*, *Vita*, 5. 6.

ror, and as superseded at his own request¹: which might be by Urbicus. The mention of Urbicus by name may, perhaps, imply that he was præfect not only when the incident in question happened, but when the Apology was written; and had not yet been superseded by any other, in that office; whether he was so afterwards or not. If the Acta of Justin are to be credited, when he himself suffered, one Rusticus was præfect: and in this respect the Acta are confirmed by Epiphanius^{m*}.

And this is not improbable—for this maternal uncle of Sicinius Æmilianus in point of age would be a contemporary of his own avus, or grandfather; and this grandfather was only just dead, when Pudentilla determined to marry again.

Now this determination, as we have seen, was formed not long before Apuleius came to Œa; and that was, only in the third year before the oration was delivered. If so, the inquiry at Rome, before Urbicus, into the authenticity of the will, was going on only three or four years, at the utmost, before the Oratio de Magia was pronounced: and if this oration was pronounced when Claudius Maximus was proconsul, not long after U. C. 905, perhaps Urbicus was actually in office, in or before U. C. 901. This is the nearest approximation to the date of his mayoralty, that I am able to make.

We have him mentioned by name, it is true, in the Opera inedita of Fronto, pars ii. 301, 302. in the fragment of the Oratio pro Volumnio Sereno, there

preserved—as having been governor of the Regio Veneta, some time before Arrius Antoninus, to whom that oration is addressed—some time before the death of the emperor Verus (page 301.) and probably within five years of the time when that oration was penned (see page 308.) But all this belongs no doubt to the reign of Marcus Aurelius.

As Capitolinus, Vita Antonini Pii, 8. mentions that Antoninus made it a rule not to supersede any magistrate or officer of state, under him, so long as he continued to acquit himself well in the discharge of his duties, this is another reason for supposing that Urbicus succeeded to Orphitus, as urbis præfectus; and more probably early in the reign of Antoninus, than late. It would also imply that, once appointed to that office, he might continue to exercise it until late in the emperor's reign.

* Dio or Xiphilinus, lxxi. 35. and Capitolinus, Vita, 3. mention a Junius Rusticus, as one of the emperor Marcus' teachers in philosophy: and eminently honoured by him. He might be this

¹ Capitolinus, Vita, 8. A. B. Tatiani, i.

^m Acta Martyrum 58. 1. 59. 2. Epiphanius, i. 391.

There is a presentiment in this Apology that the death of the writer would some time or other be brought to pass through the machinations of Crescens, his enemyⁿ; which misgiving the Oratio of Tatian, ad Gentes, (a contemporary and disciple of Justin's,) shews to have been in all probability realized by the event^o. Yet Tatian speaks in the same work of philosophers, who received an annual pension of six hundred gold pieces from the emperor: and as he mentions only *one* emperor, it is possible he may mean Antoninus Pius; particularly as Capitolinus tells us of this emperor, *Rhetoribus et philosophis per omnes provincias honores et salaria detulit* P^{*}.

urbis præfectus, and he would flourish under Antoninus Pius. The same person, apparently, is thrice mentioned by Marcus Antoninus, *De Rebus suis*, as one of his instructors; lib. i. 7. and 17. It appears from Capitolinus, *loco citato*, that he died before Marcus, and as we may collect, in the year when he was designated by him consul the second time. His first consulate was A. D. 162. in the second of Marcus. He had probably been *urbis præfectus* before this time: in which case, if Justin suffered under him in that capacity, he suffered in the reign of Antoninus Pius.

* Lucian, *Operum* ii. 352. Eunuchus, 3, speaks of a salary appointed by the emperor then reigning, for philosophers of all the sects, indiscriminately, of 10,000 drachmæ per annum; which is two thirds of Tatian's sum of 600 aurei. Some of

Lucian's commentators suppose this emperor was M. Aurelius; but he might just as well be Antoninus Pius; for Lucian flourished under both. Marcus Aurelius certainly made the same allowance; but it might be only in imitation of what Antoninus had done.

From an obscure allusion in Suidas' account of Aristocles, a sophist of Pergamus, whom he describes as having flourished under Trajan and Hadrian, it might be inferred that some provision for the maintenance of the sophists and philosophers, out of the privy purse, existed in the time of the latter. Jerome, in *Chronico*, ad Domitiani viii. tells us that Quintilian was the first of the professors of Rhetoric at Rome, *Qui salarium e fisco accepit*, and that in the reign of Domitian: as indeed it were easy to collect from various passages in his own *Institutiones*,

ⁿ P. 120. 6. ^o Cap. 32. Cf. 31. Cf. Eusebius, E. H. iv. xvi. 136, 137. Vita, 11. See also 10. and Dio, lxxi. 35.

Though Tatian is described in ecclesiastical history as an hæresiarch, and as the founder of the sect of the

(see iv. Proœmium, 2.) must have been the case. A public provision for the sophists, philosophers, and learned of the age, in general, though not necessarily in the shape of an annual salary, yet of a daily maintenance, was, in fact, of much earlier date than the reign of either of the Antonines. Philostratus, in his *Life of Dionysius of Miletus*, *Vitæ Sophistarum*, i. 524. C. D. tells us that among other honours conferred upon him by Hadrian, his contemporary, one was his incorporating him with τοῖς ἐν τῷ Μουσείῳ σιτουμένοις. τὸ δὲ Μουσεῖον, he proceeds, τράπεζα Αἰγυπτία, ξυγκαλοῦσα τοὺς ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ ἑλλογίμους. The same distinction was awarded by Hadrian to the sophist Polemo also; *Vitæ Sophistarum*, i. 532. B. C. This allusion to the Museum, and to the privilege in question, is illustrated by Spartian, *Hadrianus*, 20: Suetonius, *Claudius*, 42. §. 7: and Strabo, xvii. 1. §. 8. 503. whence it appears to have been an institution as old as the time of the Ptolemies. The Museum was situated in Alexandria, in that part of the city which went by the name of the Bruchium; a distinguished college or seminary of learned men in every department. Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus, *Lib. xxii.* 16, 343, who calls it *Diuturnum præstantium hominum domicilium*. Eusebius and Jerome, in *Chronico*, record its destruction in the first of Claudius, A. D. 268 or 269, probably in consequence of the war between the Romans and Zenobia, to whom Egypt was subject pre-

viously. Ammianus, *loco citato*, perhaps more correctly places its destruction under Aurelian.

Philostratus, *Vitæ Sophistarum*, i. 526. C. the first to preside over the Sophists' throne at Athens, was Lollianus: though whether for a stipend or not, does not appear. From what is afterwards related of Theodotus, a pupil of his, the latter is more probable. It appears, however, from the same authority, ii. 565. A. B., that the first of the emperors who made provision for the payment of the sophists at Athens, in particular, was Marcus Aurelius. It appears too, that the salary appointed there for the public instructors of the youth, was just this sum of 10,000 drachmæ, expressed in Greek by μυρία, or ἐπὶ μυρία: in reference to which we meet with the following allusions in Philostratus; first, *Vitæ Sophistarum*, ii. 565. A. de Theodoto: προέστη δὲ καὶ τῆς τῶν Ἀθηναίων νεότητος πρῶτος ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκ βασιλέως μυρία: and again, *ibid.* 588. A. de Chresto: οὐχ αἱ μυρία τὸν ἄνδρα. The ellipsis in each instance is δραχμαῖς or δραχμαί; the time of the first of these allusions being, as it appears, the reign of Marcus, and that of the second in particular, early in the reign of Commodus.

In the reign of Severus, Apollonius of Athens is mentioned by Philostratus, as presiding over the θρόνος πολιτικός ἐπὶ τάλαντι: ii. 597. A. B. C. If the office thus designated was the same as that of the sophist in

Encratitæ; yet it is also agreed that he did not fall away before the death of Justin, his master. Epiphanius supposes Justin to have suffered in the time of Hadrian; (which is palpably false;) and in the thirtieth year of his age—which probably is not less erroneous^q: but what he further supposes, viz. that Tatian his disciple founded his sect in the neighbourhood of Antioch in Syria, about the twelfth of Antoninus Pius; may possibly be true. The twelfth of Antoninus would begin, U. C. 902, at which time, or soon after it, Justin might be dead. We know no more on this subject, from Tatian's *Oratio ad Gentes*, than that it was written after the death of Justin, when the writer himself either then was, or had been previously at Rome^r. Prosper in *Chronico* places Justin's martyrdom, U. C. 911, and the heresy of Tatian, U. C. 924. Eusebius in *Chronico* places the former event about the fifteenth of Antoninus, U. C. 905*. Jerome in

the time of Marcus, the salary of the office had been diminished by the reign of Severus; for one talent was scarcely two thirds of 10,000 drachmæ. It would be easy to illustrate the continuance of the office of sophist, in the principal cities of the empire, and of a salary, greater or less, attached to it, through the reigns of succeeding emperors down to the time of Constantine. We find mention made of the payment of a talent, or ἐνὶ μνρίας, by individuals, for the privilege of hearing particular sophists; as, for instance, by Damianus of Ephesus, in order to become the disciple of Ari-

stides of Smyrna, and Hadrian of Ephesus: Philostratus, ii. 602. A. B.

In later times, many curious particulars might be collected from Eunapius' *Lives of the Sophists*, to illustrate the above observations. See especially, his *Proæresius*, 74. 79. 89. Cf. *Julianus*, 68. 69. 73. *Maximus*, 52: and *Suidas*, in *Αἰδεσία*.

* Yet in his *Ecclesiastical History* he dates the martyrdom of Justin about the same time with that of Polycarp; viz. the seventh of M. Aurelius: E. H. iv. xvi. 136. B. Cf. also iv. xxix. xxx. which places the acme of Tatian in the reign of M. Aurelius.

^q Operum i. 391. A.—D. Tatiani, i. Cf. Theodorit. Operum iv. 311. Hæreticarum Fabularum i. 20.

^r Cap. 56.

Chronico places the death of Justin in the thirteenth of Antoninus Pius, and Tatian's heresy in the twelfth of Marcus Aurelius^s, in which year Eusebius on the contrary, places the rise of Montanism, or the Cataphrygian heresy. Notwithstanding this difference of dates, for the time of the death of Justin, or for that of the rise of the sect of the Encratitæ, I see no reason to question our original position; which is the supposed date of Justin's first Apology, U. C. 899.

IRENÆUS—That our Lord was baptized at thirty; that the preceding thirty years of his life were spent in inactivity; that his ministry lasted *one* year; are opinions repeatedly ascribed by Irenæus to the Valentinians. See lib. i. cap. i. p. 9. l. 5: p. 15. l. 16: p. 16. l. 24. lib. ii. cap. x. 130. l. 16: cap. xv. 134. l. 28, &c.

With respect to this last opinion however; the absolute length of time between the commencement of our Lord's ministry, and the ascension into heaven, must have been considered by these followers of Valentinus, an interval of two years and eight months; which very nearly implies a ministry of three years' duration*. I ground this assertion on the following pas-

* It would equally nearly approach to the period of the three years in question, if the statement which occurs in Ambrose, Operum ii. 951. A. B. Epistolæ, xl. §. 16. in his letter to the emperor Theodosius, that the Valentinians recognised thirty-two Æons, might be implicitly taken for granted: Licet gentiles duodecim deos appellent, isti triginta et duos Æonas co-

lant, quos appellant deos. It is true, our other authorities for the opinions of the Valentinians, Irenæus, Tertullian, Epiphanius, Theodorit, represent the number of Æons, recognised by them, to be thirty: and the editors of Ambrose think the other two may be accounted for by supposing him to include among the rest, the Sige and Bythus, out of which the Æons of the Va-

^s Cf. De SS. Ecclesiasticis, xxix. Operum iv. Pars ii^a. 111. Jerome dates the rise of Montanism the year before.

sage^s: καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς δεκαοκτὼ Αἰῶνας φανεροῦσθαι διὰ τοῦ μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν δεκαοκτὼ μηνὶ λέγειν διατετριφέναι αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς. Cf. p. 112. l. 22. cap. xxxiv. where the same statement is repeated: Rememoratum autem eum post resurrectionem xviii. mensibus, et sensibilitate in eum descendente didicisse quod liquidum est: et paucos ex discipulis suis, quos sciebat capaces tantorum mysteriorum, docuit hæc, et sic receptus est in cœlum, &c.

The most authentic accounts of Valentinus, the founder of this sect, represent him as contemporary with Hyginus, the ninth bishop of Rome; and to have flourished in the reign of Hadrian, or early in that of Antoninus Pius^t. Clemens Alexandrinus tells us that he was said to have been an hearer of Theodadis, Theodas, or Theudas, who had personally known St. Paul^u. Notwithstanding, therefore, the errors of doctrine into which he fell, the circumstance of his coming so near to the apostolical times must give weight to his opinions concerning facts—which he might have learned, by only one intermediate link, from the testimony of St. Paul himself. And as to his errors of faith or

lentinians took their rise. The number of the Æons, in any case, has respect to the number of months in the duration of the personal ministry of the Christ, between his baptism and his ascension into heaven. If the number of Æons was thirty, so was the number of months. If the former was thirty-two, so was the latter. It is however

to be observed, that others of the school of Valentinus, as Ptolemæus and Secundus, added to the number of his Æons; yet according to Tertullian, *De Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum*, 49. *Operum* ii. 73. not simply two but eight more than he supposed. Cf. *Adversus Valentinianos*, 33–38: *Ibid.* 183–188. Also, *Irenæus*, i. 5, 6. p. 49–55.

^s Lib. i. v. 16. 10. ^t Irenæus, iii. iv. 206. l. 18: Tertullian, ii. 35. *De Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum*, 30: also 147. *Contra Valentinianos*, 4: Eusebius, E. H. iv. 10, 11. 22. 30: Epiphanius i. 164. A. Valentiniani 2: Theodorit, iv. 296. *Hæreticarum Fabularum* i. 7. Eusebius and Jerome in *Chronico*, ad Antonini Pii vi. ^u Opera, ii. 898. l. 12. *Strom.* vii. 17.

doctrine, Tertullian informs us he did not become an hæresiarch, until he had been disappointed of a bishopric.

It may be inferred, also, from the following passage, that they thought our Lord was born at the same time in one year, at which he was baptized and suffered in another: *Illam enim, quam circa duodecimum Æonem dicunt accidisse passionem, conantur ostendere, quod Salvatoris passio a duodecimo apostolorum facta sit, et in duodecimo mense. uno enim anno volunt eum post baptismum prædicasse* ^x. I consider this to mean the twelfth month of his ministry; though Irenæus understands it of the twelfth month in the year, and charges the Valentinians with an absurdity accordingly. There is an end of the analogy for which this sect contended, if the ministry in question was either more or less than a year in duration. The same thing follows, if our Lord was supposed to have been baptized at more or less than the age of thirty. As they supposed him, therefore, to have been baptized at thirty complete, so they supposed him to have suffered at thirty-one complete; and consequently to have been born at the same time of the year, at which he was baptized and suffered.

I cannot dismiss this subject, without taking notice of a very extraordinary opinion of Irenæus' own; viz. that though he believed our Lord to have been baptized in his thirtieth year, he did not consider him to have entered on his ministry, until he was forty or fifty. The reasons of his opinion are thus stated ^y: *Triginta quidem annorum existens cum veniret ad baptismum, deinde magistri ætatem perfectam habens, venit Hierusalem, ita ut ab omnibus juste audiretur (leg. audiret) magister magister ergo existens,*

^x Irenæus, ii. xxxvi. l. 24.

^y Lib. ii. xxxix. 160. l. 30.

magistri quoque habebat ætatem . . . illi autem, ut figmentum suum, de eo quod est scriptum, *vocare annum Domini acceptum*, affirmant, dicunt uno anno eum prædicasse, et duodecimo mense passum quomodo autem docebat, magistri ætatem non habens? . . . et si (*ita leg.*) a baptismo uno tantum anno prædicavit, complens trigesimum annum passus est, adhuc juvenis existens, æt qui necdum provectionem haberet ætatem. quia autem triginta annorum ætas prima indolis est juvenis, et extenditur usque ad quadragesimum annum, omnis quilibet confitebitur: a quadragesimo autem et quinquagesimo anno declinat jam in ætatem seniore: quam habens Dominus noster docebat, sicut Evangelium, καὶ πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι μαρτυροῦσιν, οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἰωάννη τῷ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῇ συμβεβληκότες, παραδεδωκέναι ταῦτα τὸν Ἰωάννην. παρέμεινε γὰρ αὐτοῖς μέχρι τῶν Τραϊανοῦ χρόνων. quidam autem eorum non solum Joannem, sed et alios apostolos viderunt, et hæc eadem ab ipsis audierunt, et testantur de hujusmodi relatione.

Notwithstanding the traditionary authority to which he appeals in support of this opinion, it is so improbable, that no one can hesitate to reject it. Nor would I be understood to say that there was no traditionary authority for the substance of the above statement in general; but only, that in all probability, the testimony of St. John and of the other apostles, to which it refers, went no further than this; viz. that when our Lord entered on his ministry, he had, what Irenæus calls, the *perfecta magistri ætas*: which among the Jews was thirty: he was in the full possession of all the natural powers both of mind and of body^z.

It is clear, from the reasoning of Irenæus, that he himself understood the perfect age of a master or

^z See Dissertation xi. vol. i. 374—380.

teacher to begin at *forty*, not at *thirty*; in which respect there is no doubt, that his opinion was opposed to that of the Jews. If then his traditionary testimony had been given simply to this effect, that when our Saviour entered upon the work of teaching he was of the full age for a master or teacher—though that in reality might mean no more than that he was of the full age of thirty—it is morally certain, that Irenæus would understand it of the age of forty. In a word, that our Lord was of the perfect age of a master when he entered on his ministry, might be truly said to have been traditionally handed down from St. John, through the elders; that he was consequently forty, and not merely thirty, at the same time, is an inference from this fact, or a gloss upon the traditions of Irenæus' time, which is not to be received as sanctioned by the same authority, but to be rejected as inconsistent with it.

In support of the same opinion, he lays some stress in the next chapter, upon the implicit testimony of John viii. 57: πεντήκοντα ἔτη οὐπω ἔχεις καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἑώρακας; which he thinks would not have been said to Jesus, if he had not been more than forty, and known to be so by the speakers. But Irenæus mistook the meaning of this text: which has nothing to do with the absolute age of our Lord at the time; with his personal appearance, as looking older than he really might be, or the like: but was, as I should understand it, simply intended to remind him he was still a *young* man; he was not yet of an age even to be called *old*—how then could he have seen Abraham? The age of fifty is mentioned, because that was the first age at which men began properly to be considered old. Irenæus himself proves this^a: *Quinque ætates transit*

^a Lib. ii. xlii. 166. 22.

humanum genus : primum infans, deinde puer, deinde parvulus, (μειράκιον,) et posthæc juvenis, sic deinde senior : and the age of *juvenis* he fixes above to begin at thirty, and to end at forty. The Persians placed the beginning of old age at fifty-two : the Roman law at fifty^b. Jerome, in Is. iii. observes : Tuli *senem* et *quingagenarium*, et admirabilem consiliarium, et sapientem architectum, et prudentem conditorem, etc., from which it appears that *senex* and *quingagenarius* were convertible terms^c. Cf. on this subject, the passages collected, Dissertation xi. vol. i. 377–379*.

Lastly, we may observe, that after the commencement of our Lord's ministry, whether at thirty or forty years of age, Irenæus reckons three passovers^d ; the first, John ii. 13 : the second, the controverted one of John v. 1 : Quando paralyticum qui juxta natatoriam jacebat xxxviii annos, curavit : of which, however, he speaks without any hesitation, as of a Passover. The third Passover, is the last ; when Jesus came to Bethany, six days before it, and is represented in the Gospels as, Manducans Pascha, et sequenti die passus. With respect to any other Passover, though he men-

* In some ancient references to it, the above text is quoted with the reading of τεσσαράκοντα, instead of πενήκοντα : for instance, Chrysostom, Operum i. 505. A. Homilia vii. 3 : and viii. 324. A. in Joannem Homilia lv. 2. The latter is no doubt the true reading—but the former might easily get substituted for it—with a view perhaps to bring

the statement within the bounds of probability, supposing our Lord's true age at the time to have been thirty and upwards. "Thou art not yet forty," referred to the true state of the case, would be an observation, on the principle of a general, indefinite and conjectural mode of speaking, much more tolerable than, "Thou art not yet fifty."

^b Xenophon, Cyropædia, i. ii. §. 12, 13. Cf. Zonaras, iii. xv. 147. D. Pliny, Epp. iv. 23. Seneca, de Brevitate Vitæ, xx. 3. Seneca Pater, Controversiæ, i. viii. 138. Aulus Gellius, x. 28. Suidas, voce Διατρήτας, and Ἐφέραι, will shew that the same thing held good at Athens. ^c Hieronymus, iii. 36. *ad principium*. Cf. Josephus, Ant. Jud. iii. viii. 2. xii. 4. Numbers iv. 3, &c. ^d Lib. ii. xxxix. 160.

tions our Lord's departure over the sea of Galilee, and his feeding the five thousand, he says nothing of the Passover's being near at hand: whether because he did not read this circumstance in his copy of St. John's Gospel, or because he overlooked it, I do not undertake to say.

That others besides Irenæus, entertained the same opinions respecting the age of our Lord, appears from a passage of Augustin^d, which I have produced elsewhere. It appears also from the ἀντικείμενα of Stephen Gobarus, of which Photius has given us an abstract^e; ὅτι ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς λ'. ἐνιαυτῶν ὑπάρχων ἐσταυρώθη· καὶ ὅτι οὐ λ'. ἀλλὰ γ'. καὶ λ'. καὶ ὅτι οὐ γ'. καὶ λ'. ἀλλὰ μ'. καὶ ὅτι οὔτε λ'. ἐτῶν οὔτε μ'. μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλεόν, οὐ πολὺ τῶν ν'. ἀφεστηκώς.

It is observable that this writer, whose work consisted of a collection of contrary opinions upon questions of fact or of doctrine—knew of no opinion, except the last two, which did not suppose our Saviour to be either thirty, or thirty-three, years old at his death; and therefore his ministry, between his baptism and his death, to have been of one year's, or of three years', duration.

The same writer, loc. cit. l. 42, mentions an opinion that Christ ascended into heaven on the day after his resurrection from the dead, upon the *sixteenth* day of the month: which may render it less extraordinary that others on the contrary, like the Valentinians, should have thought there was even more than a forty days' interval between those two events.

Epiphanius, quoting from one of these Valentinian authors, (though the passage in the original is exceed-

^d Opera, iii. 36. De Doctrina Christiana, lib. ii. 42. Vide Dissertation iv. vol. i. 245. ^e Photius, Codex, 232. page 290. l. 14.

ingly corrupt,) writes thus ^f: The everlasting Word of God was born about the fortieth of Augustus. The same author added, he says, On the XII of the Kalends of July or June, I cannot tell which, in the consulship of Sulpicius Camerinus, and Buteo Pompeianus.

The fortieth of Augustus bears date from U. C. 711: and the birth of Christ would thus be placed May 21. or June 20. U. C. 750 or U. C. 751. The important circumstance in this tradition is that the nativity is supposed to have taken place in the spring quarter of the year: an opinion which Epiphanius does not attempt to controvert, except by considering it possible that it might have confounded the nativity with the annunciation; and if, as some persons had thought, Christ was born at the end of *seven* months, instead of *nine*, the nativity might yet take place on the 6th of January; which is his own date for it.

As to the two consuls, in whose year the nativity is said to have happened, it is in vain to search for them in the Fasti, U. C. 750 or U. C. 751. Yet that Epiphanius had some real foundation for the statement which he has made, is proved by the following references. Syncellus ^g tells us that our Lord was born on the twenty-fifth of Chasleu or December, in the forty-third (*leg.* 42.) of Augustus, ἐν ὑπατείᾳ Σουλπικίου Καμερίνου, καὶ Γαίου Ποππαίου, ὡς ἐν ἀκριβέσι καὶ παλαιοῖς ἀντιγράφοις φέρεται. The forty-second of Augustus, it is true, would be U. C. 752: and these two were consuls U. C. 762. On the same authority Syncellus asserts that our Saviour suffered, coss. Nerone iii. et Valerio Messala ^h, U. C. 811.

Perhaps the source of these traditions is indicated in the fragment published by Muratori, and ascribed to Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem about the end of the

^f Opera, i. 450. D. Alogi, xxviii. xxix.

^g i. 597. 5.

^h i. 607. 9.

third century¹: in which the nativity is placed viii. Kal. Jan. Sulpitio et Camerino (*corrigere* Camerino et Sabino) coss. (U. C. 762:) the baptism viii. Idus Jan. Valeriano et Asiatico (Asiatico et Silano, U. C. 799.) and the passion x. Kal. April. Nerone iii. et Messala coss. U. C. 811. To explain these dates, or to pretend to account for their origin, would be an hopeless undertaking: yet the last of them is consistent with the opinion that our Lord suffered at forty-nine or fifty. And the first of them might be produced by confounding two things together; viz. the birth of Christ *in* the forty-second of Augustus, and yet *in* the consulship of Sulpicius Camerinus and Poppæus Sabinus. The former of these answered to U. C. 752, the latter to U. C. 762, between which the difference is ten years.

A ten years' difference in the era of the first consulate, or the accidental omission of *ten* successive names in some copies of the Fasti, before U. C. 752; might make a particular consulate, according to one mode of computation, belong to U. C. 752, which according to the truth would belong to U. C. 762. The old Valentinian author, however, quoted by Epiphanius, joins the consulate in question with the fortieth of Augustus. The consuls, U. C. 750, which would answer to that year, were C. Calvisius Sabinus, and L. Patienus Rufus: and considering the many corruptions of the readings both of names and numbers, in the extant works of Epiphanius, it is just possible that, instead of Sulpicius Camerinus and Buteo Pompeianus, (the last of which names appears nowhere,) he might actually have written Calvisius Sabinus and Patienus Rufus.

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS—Opera, i. 407. 18.

¹ Reliquiæ Sacræ, ii. 49. *ad calcem*.

Stromatum i. 21. l. 18: εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ περιεργότερον τῇ γενέσει τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν οὐ μόνον τὸ ἔτος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν προστιθέντες· ἣν φασιν ἔτους κή. Αὐγούστου ἐν πέμπτῃ Πάχων καὶ εἰκάδι. οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Βασιλείδου καὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος αὐτοῦ τὴν ἡμέραν ἑορτάζουσι, προδιανυκτερεύοντες ἀναγνώσει. φασὶ δὲ εἶναι τὸ πεντεκαιδέκατον ἔτος Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, τὴν πεντεκαιδεκάτην τοῦ Τυβὶ μηνός· τινὲς δὲ αὐτὴν ἐνδεκάτην τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνός. τό τε πάθος αὐτοῦ ἀκριβολογούμενοι φέρουσιν οἱ μὲν τινες τῷ ἐκκαιδεκάτῳ ἔτει Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, Φαμενώθ κέ· οἱ δὲ Φαρμουθὶ κέ· ἄλλοι δὲ Φαρμουθὶ ιθ', πεπονθέναι τὸν Σωτῆρα λέγουσιν. καὶ μὴν τινες αὐτῶν φασὶ Φαρμουθὶ γεγενῆσθαι κδ' ἢ κέ'.

With regard to these dates, if the first of Thoth in the Egyptian year be supposed to correspond to the 29th of August, the 11th of Tybi answers to January 6, and the 15th to January 10: the 25th of Phamenoth to March 21: the 19th of Pharmuthi to April 14: the 24th of Pharmuthi to April 19: the 25th to April 20: and the 25th of Pachon to May 20.

I think it is evident from the perusal of this passage, that as to the quarter of the year to which the Baptism, the Birth, and the Passion of Christ, were respectively referred by these opinions, Clement did not disagree with them. If he speaks of the curiosity of their authors in terms approaching to censure; it is only because they had attempted to go further, and to ascertain not merely the time of the year, but the very day of the events in question in each instance.

Under these circumstances, it is scarcely to be supposed that Clement himself would think of *fixing* the *day* of the Nativity; and much less of assigning it to a quarter of the year the very reverse of that which is specified above. Yet this must be the case, if, as he proceeds, *loc. cit.* to say, from the birth of Christ to

the death of Commodus, there was 194 years', one month's, and thirteen days' interval.

The death of Commodus happened on December 31, U. C. 945^k: and consequently the birth of our Lord, on this principle, would bear date November 18 or 19, U. C. 751. But Clement himself places the Nativity in the *twenty-eighth* of Augustus, which he dates from the reduction of Egypt, August, U. C. 724: and consequently he places it either U. C. 751, or U. C. 752. It could not be in U. C. 751; for he supposes the Passion itself to take place in the fifteenth of Tiberius, U. C. 782, when our Lord was thirty years of age. Hence, at whatever time he supposed him to be thirty, U. C. 782, at the same time he must have supposed him to be born, U. C. 752. Reckoning, as he does, the reign of Augustus at 43 years, and placing the Nativity in his 28th, and the Passion in the fifteenth of Tiberius—thirty years after the birth of Christ; he must have supposed our Lord to have lived fifteen years and six months under Augustus, and fourteen years and six months under Tiberius: and consequently to have been born in the spring of U. C. 752, as he suffered in the spring of U. C. 782.

The truth is, that nothing is more corrupt than the numeral readings which occur in the text of Clement. It would be an endless task to specify all the instances of this corruption, which might be produced. The subject under discussion supplies one: for whereas the sum total of the interval between the birth of Christ and the death of Commodus, is stated at 194 years, and upwards; the particular details amount to 200 years, and upwards, involving an error of excess of at least six years. In another passage—where the reigns

^k Dio, lxxii. 22. Capitolinus, Pertinax, 4. Herodian, i. 49—55. ii. 5.

of the Roman emperors from Augustus to Commodus are given in detail, while the whole is put at 222 years¹*, the details amount only to 220.

In another instance, from Romulus, or the foundation of Rome, to the death of Commodus, it is reckoned 953 years, six months^m; a statement which cannot be true in any sense, unless we suppose Clement to have written originally 943 years, six months. For his date of the foundation of Rome is the Catonian, B. C. 752, not the Varronian, B. C. 754: as appears from his reckoning 24 years between the first Olympiad; (for which he follows the received date, B. C. 776ⁿ;) and the era of that foundation. U. C. 943, as referred to B. C. 752, answers to U. C. 945, referred to B. C. 754. But even in this case the death of Commodus is placed six months or more too late. For he died on the last day of U. C. 943, according to Cato, and of U. C. 945, according to Varro; not U. C. 944, in the one case, or U. C. 946, in the other: as Clement, however, seems uniformly to reckon.

The fractions of years, in particular, which enter into some of his dates, are to be received with distrust: as in almost every instance they manifestly labour under some corruption or other. For example, from Adam to Commodus, it is reckoned 5784 years, *two months, twelve days*^o. If so, the creation of the world is placed October 19. A. M. 1. But that Clement would undertake to define the day of its creation is very improbable: and if he did, why he should fix on this day in particular, or any thereabouts, would be just as inexplicable. Later Egyptian chronologists

* So also from the death of Antony to the death of Commodus, it is reckoned 222 years, p. 403. l. 29.

¹ Operum i. 405. 27—406. 8. ^m i. 406. l. 29. ⁿ i. 401. 32—402. 19. Stromatum i. 21. ^o i. 406. l. 7.

might have done so; as their opinions inclined them to fix the era of creation synchronously with the Thoth of the Egyptian year—about August 29.

With regard to the fraction of time in the present instance—from the date of the Passion to the death of Commodus—it is made up of the composition of two numbers, both of them corrupt: one, that of 42 years, three months, between the Passion in the fifteenth of Tiberius, U. C. 782, and the destruction of Jerusalem, U. C. 823; the other, 128 years, ten months, and three days, between the destruction of Jerusalem, U. C. 823, and the death of Commodus, Dec. 31. U. C. 945. There is an error of one year at least in the former date, and of six years at least in the latter. That Clement knew U. C. 823 to be the date of the destruction of Jerusalem, appears from his reckoning it 77 years, between the second of Vespasian, when it was destroyed, and the tenth of Antoninus Pius^p. From U. C. 823, 77 years bring us to U. C. 900, the tenth of Pius. On this principle, deducting the seven years of excess in question, Clement must have reckoned it 163 years from U. C. 782 to U. C. 945; and if he placed the Nativity in the spring, U. C. 752, he might reckon it from thence, to the death of Commodus, 193 years, ten months, and a certain number of days, or 194 current years: or he might reckon it 194 years, within *one* month, and *thirteen* days; which, if he supposed our Saviour to have been born about the same time of the year when he was baptized, would probably be near the truth.

It is surprising that this father should so plainly place the Passion of Christ in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and yet suppose forty-two years, from that time to the destruction of Jerusalem, U. C. 823. In

^p Operum i. 409. l. 14. Stromatum i. 21.

this statement, however, he is followed by Origen, and by Jerome: *εἰ δὲ θέλεις, ἄκουε ἀπὸ πέντε καὶ δεκάτου ἔτους Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἐπὶ τὴν κατασκαφὴν τοῦ ναοῦ τεσσαράκοντα καὶ δύο πεπλήρωται ἔτη* ^q. Prius enim Evangelium Salvatoris in toto orbe prædicatum est: et post quadraginta duos annos Dominicæ passionis capta Jerusalem, templumque succensum est ^r—Nec grande fuit tempus in medio. nam post quadraginta et duos annos Dominicæ crucis circumdata est ab exercitu Jerusalem ^s—Itaque impetravit, quod petierat: multaque statim de Judæis millia crediderunt, et usque ad quadragesimum secundum annum datum est tempus pœnitentiæ ^t. This mistake is so much the more inexcusable in Jerome, because his date for the Passion is two years later, the seventeenth of Tiberius, U.C. 784: and Origen, in another instance, quoting the Chronica of Phlegon, computes the interval more correctly, Circa quadragesimum annum a quinto decimo anno Tiberii Cæsaris ^u. Chrysostom also reckons the interval at forty years and upwards: though his date for the Passion is one year later than Jerome's ^x. So little solicitous do these writers seem to have been, about verifying their dates, before they allowed them to remain on record.

Clement's opinion of the length of our Saviour's

^q Origen, Operum iii. 217. A. in Jerem. Homilia xiv. 13. Also Contra Celsum, iv. 22. Operum i. 515. E. ^r Hieronymus, Operum iii. 61. *ad medium*, in Isaïæ vi. ^s Ib. iii. 1656. *ad calcem*, In Sophon. i. ^t Ib. iv. pars i. 177. *ad medium*, Hedibæ. ^u Operum iii. 859. C. Comm. in Matt. Series secundum Veterem Interpretationem, 40. ^x Operum vii. 680. B. in Matthæum Homilia lxix. 1. and iii. 95. C. Cur in Pentecoste Acta App. legantur, 9. The Hypomnesticon of Joseph, v. cxxiii. 255. places the destruction of the temple by Vespasian and Titus, thirty-eight years after the Ascension: which, if the Ascension were dated in the eighteenth of Tiberius, U.C. 785, would be correct. The Chronicon of Julius Pollux, like Chrysostom, makes the interval in question forty years (see page 200.) though this too, like Chrysostom, places the Passion in the eighteenth of Tiberius, p. 172. 180. These statements were probably taken from Eusebius, who likewise supposes forty years complete between the Passion and the destruction of Jerusalem, E. H. iii. 7. 82. A: though he too dates the Passion in the eighteenth of Tiberius: see i. 9, 10. 13. The interval of forty years between the Passion and the destruction of Jerusalem is true of no date of the Passion, but the sixteenth of Tiberius, U.C. 783.

ministry, as not exceeding one year, appears sufficiently from the extracts given, Dissertation xiii. vol. i. 439. 455. It seems, likewise, from the fragment e Libro de Paschate, Operum ii. 1017. l. 15. that he considered the Passover at which our Saviour suffered, to be the first which he celebrated after the commencement of his ministry; and this also implies a ministry previously, of not more than one year in duration.

TERTULLIAN—I am not aware of any passages in the works of Tertullian, from which it might be collected at what time of the year he thought our Saviour was born; except this one, which may be produced from the *Liber adversus Judæos*, caput 8; and from this too it is to be inferred only by implication.

He supposes Augustus (p. 297.) to have survived the Nativity *fifteen* years; and he places the Passion (p. 299.) in the *fifteenth* of Tiberius, when Christ was *quasi triginta annorum*. As he says nothing of fractions of years, either he speaks very inaccurately, or he must date the reign of Augustus from U. C. 711. *ineunte*, and that of Tiberius from U. C. 767. *ineunte*: in which case the Nativity might be placed in the forty-first of the former *exeunte*, spring, U. C. 752, and the Passion, in the fifteenth of the latter *exeunte*, U. C. 782, when our Lord might be supposed to be just thirty complete.

He reckons further *in diem Nativitatis Christi* (p. 297.), from the first of Darius (p. 295.), sixty-two prophetic weeks and an half, or four hundred and thirty-seven years and six months; as, again, in another instance (p. 298, 299.), from the Passion in the fifteenth of Tiberius, to the end of the reign of Vespasian, he reckons seven weeks and an half—or fifty-two years and six months. These calculations may

not be exact; but I think we may infer from them that he placed the Nativity in the spring; as well as the Passion. These two periods of sixty-two weeks and an half, and of seven weeks and an half, are intended to make up seventy weeks in all; or four hundred and ninety years: and the first of them ending with the Nativity, and the second beginning with the Passion, it is reasonable to suppose they were intended to be as continuous as the nature of the case would permit; and (with the exception of the thirty years from the Nativity to the Passion interposed) to end and to proceed alike. The interposition of these thirty years is no objection; for Tertullian's idea of the prophecy is that the sixty-two weeks were purposely detached from the seven (p. 295. 297, 298.); in order that the birth, and life, and Passion of Christ might come between them. In other respects, he must have considered its two periods continuous; and therefore, as they are supposed to end in the autumn of one year, they must be supposed to have begun with the autumn of another: from which time, 437 years, six months, the first of the periods, *in diem Nativitatis Christi*, must necessarily terminate in the spring.

ORIGEN—With respect to Origen; the testimony of Pamphilus, and the evidence of many passages in his own works imply, as we observed on the former occasion, that he once believed the length of our Saviour's ministry not to have exceeded one year and a few months. Other passages, however, will shew that he changed this opinion subsequently; and as it cannot be uninteresting to the reader to observe the gradual alteration in the sentiments of such a mind as Origen's, produced by further inquiry and meditation, I shall exhibit the passages of both kinds in their order.

Τεκμήριον γὰρ τῆς ἐκχυθείσης χάριτος ἐν χείλεσιν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὀλίγου διαγεγενημένου τοῦ χρόνου τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ, ἐνιαυτὸν γάρ πού καὶ μῆνας ὀλίγους ἐδίδαξεν, κ', τ. λ γ.

Si ergo considerem verum pontificem meum, Dominum Jesum Christum, quomodo in carne quidem positus, per totum annum erat cum populo, annum illum de quo ipse dicit: Evangelizare pauperibus misit me, et vocare annum Domini acceptum, et diem remissionis: adverte quomodo semel in anno isto, in die reprobationis intrat in sancta sanctorum, hoc est, cum impleta dispensatione penetrat coelos, et intrat ad patrem^z.

Prædicare annum Domini acceptum—juxta simplicem intelligentiam aiunt uno anno Salvatorem in Judæa evangelium prædicasse, et hoc esse quod dicitur, Prædicare^a, etc.

Ἐὰν δὲ αὐτὴ ἡ ἑορτὴ τοῦ Πάσχα ᾦν (John v. 1.) οὐ προσκεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς· στενοχωρεῖ δὲ τὸ ἀκόλουθον τῆς ἱστορίας, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπεὶ μετ' ὀλίγα ἐπιφέρεται ὅτι ᾦν ἐγγὺς ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἡ σκηνοπηγία^b.

Καίτοιγε Ἀριστοτέλης μὲν εἴκοσιν ἔτεσι λέγεται πεφοιτηκέναι Πλάτωνι· οὐκ ὀλίγον δὲ χρόνον καὶ ὁ Χρύσιππος παρὰ τῷ Κλεάνθει πεποιῆσθαι τὰς διατριβάς. ὁ δὲ Ἰούδας παρὰ τῷ Ἰησοῦ οὐδὲ τρία διέτριψεν ἔτη^c.

Si autem oportet et de temporibus aliquid dicere; dicimus quoniam in Chronicis Phlegontis cujusdam dicitur, (si tamen debemus et hunc quasi vera dicentem de templo suscipere,) quoniam circa quadragesimum annum a quinto decimo anno Tiberii Cæsaris facta est destructio Jerusalem, et templi quod fuit in ea. deduc ergo prædicationis Domini fere annos tres, et tempus resurrectionis ipsius, quando per dies quadra-

^y Operum i. 160. De Principiis, iv. 5.

Homilia ix. 5.

^a Operum iii. 970. C. in Lucam Homilia xxxii.

iv. 250. A. B. in Joh. Comm. tom. xiii. 39.

Celsum, ii. 12.

^z Operum ii. 239. C. In Leviticum

^b Operum

^c Operum i. 397. E. Contra

ginta apparens illis docebat eos de regno Dei, et invenies forsitan plus minus: quoniam circa dimidium septimanæ, computans per decadas annorum, est completum quod dictum est, &c.^d

To understand this passage, we must compare it with the following just before, and with Jerome's commentary on Dan. ix.

Hæc enim septimana, quæ propter septem decadas annorum dicitur septimana, confirmat testamentum multis, quando et Apostoli Christi post ascensionem ipsius, orationi et verbo instantes, a Deo illuminabantur in omnem scientiam voluntatis divinarum scripturarum, et a Spiritu Sancto. in dimidio autem septimanæ, id est, in tribus et semis decadis annorum, sublatum est sacrificium altaris: id est in triginta quinque annis impletum est quod fuerat scriptum, &c.^e

Dicit idem Eusebius et aliam opinionem, quam ex parte non reprobō: quod plerique unam hebdomadem annorum in septuaginta annos extendant: per singulos hebdomadis annos decennio supputato. et volunt a passione Domini, usque ad Neronis imperium, annos esse triginta quinque, quando contra Judæos Romana primum arma commota sunt; et hanc esse dimidiam hebdomadam annorum septuaginta. postea vero a Vespasiano et Tito, et deinceps quando Jerosolyma templumque succensum est, usque ad Trajanum, alios esse annos triginta quinque: et hanc esse hebdomadem de qua Angelus loquitur Danieli: *Confirmabit autem pactum multis hebdomada una.* in totum enim orbem per apostolos Evangelium prædicatum est: qui usque ad illud tempus perseveraverunt, tradentibus Ecclesiasticis historiis Johannem Evangelistam usque ad tempora vixisse Trajani^f.

With regard to the dates and order of these several

^d Operum iii. 859. C. Comm. in Matt. Series secundum Veterem Interpretationem, 40. ^e Ibid. 858. F. ^f Hieronymus, Operum iii. 1114. *ad principium.*

passages, they may be determined in a great measure from the internal evidence of the works themselves; so far at least as to demonstrate that the first four are prior in point of time to the two last. The Homilies on St. Luke are quoted in the Commentaries on St. John ^g: and the Commentaries upon St. John in those on St. Matthew ^h. The Commentaries on the books of the Old Testament are frequently mentioned in the work against Celsus ⁱ.

Eusebius informs us that Origen was seventeen when his father suffered martyrdom under Severus, in the tenth year of his reign, A. D. 202*: and was eighteen when he was appointed to the head of the catechetical school at Alexandria ^k: that he emigrated from Alexandria to Cæsarea, about the tenth of Alexander Severus, A. D. 231: that five books of his Commentaries on St. John had been written before that time; and that the remainder, seventeen in number, were written after it; the last, about the time of Maximin's persecution, A. D. 235—238^l; that he was upwards of sixty in the third of Philip, when he composed his work against Celsus, and his Commentary upon St. Matthew; and that he died at sixty-nine or seventy, sometime in the persecution under Gallus, A. D. 252—254^m.

* Severus' persecution of Christianity seems to be fixed to this year by the testimony of Spartian also; Vita, 17. compared with 16; U. C. 955. A. D. 202: though in the life of Antoninus Caracallus, 1. he speaks

of some persecution, when Antoninus was seven years old: which would be A. D. 194 or 195. See Dio, lxxviii. 5, 6. 14: Herodian, iv. 26. Spartian, Antoninus, 6. 9. A. D. 194 or 195. would be the first or second of Severus.

^g xxxii. 2. Operum iv. 404. D. ^h Operum iii. 748. C. D. tom. xvi. 19, 20. Cf. 893. B. Comm. in Matt. Series, 77. and Operum iv. 192. A. in Joh. tom. x. 18. ⁱ Operum i. 530. C. lib. iv. 37: 670. E. vi. 49: 672. C. vi. 51: 678. F. vi. 60: 701. E. F. vii. 11. &c. ^k E. H. vi. 2. 3. 201. C. 203. B—204. B. ^l E. H. vi. 21. 24. 26. 28. ^m Ibid. vi. 35, 36. and vii. 1. Cf. Hieronymus, De Viris Ecclesiasticis, liv. Operum iv. pars 2^a. 115. Syncellus, 682. 8. 707. 10 Photius, Codex 118. page 92. Suidas, Ὀριγένης. The year of his death must have been A. D. 254, if he was sixty-nine complete at his death, and seventeen A. D. 202.

The precise time of the work against Celsus may very probably be collected from certain passages therein: first, where the author is speaking of the paucity of martyrs—though only in comparison of the much greater numbers who always survived these attacks on the churchⁿ—and from what he says of the continued increase of Christianity, without hindrance or molestation, at the time when he was writing^o, it seems a necessary inference that no such thing as the persecution under Decius, or under Gallus and Volusianus, had as yet taken place, and therefore that he was not writing later than A. D. 249. Secondly, from what he says of the existence of political commotions and troubles, at the time when he was writing^p, it is equally necessary to infer that he was writing at the close of the reign of the two Philippi, which is known to have been distinguished by such disturbances^q; and therefore not later than A. D. 248, or A. D. 249.

This is sufficient to prove that the work against Celsus, and consequently the Commentaries on St. Matthew, which furnish the evidence of the change in Origen's opinion of the duration of our Saviour's ministry, are the latest of his productions which have come down to us; and were written in the maturity of his judgment, and not many years before his death. The former, besides being a perfect work, which has been transmitted to us in its original state, is deservedly to be considered the most masterly of his numerous compositions; and as the index of his deliberate sentiments, ought on every account to be preferred to the rest.

When, therefore, he observes in it, ὁ δὲ Ἰουδᾶς παρὰ τῷ Ἰησοῦ οὐδὲ τρία διέτριψεν ἔτη, he cannot affirm less

ⁿ Lib. iii. 8. Operum i. 452. D. ^o Lib. vii. 26. 712. F. ^p Lib. iii. 15. 456. C. ^q Zosimus, *Historiæ*, i.

than that Judas was with Jesus more than two, though perhaps not quite three years: and this may mean, not that the ministry of our Lord did not last three years, but that Judas, like the rest of the apostles, was not called to be a disciple and to company with Jesus, until part of its first year was over. From the other passage, however, *Deduc ergo prædicationis Domini fere annos tres*, I should conclude he thought its duration was not *quite* three years; though not much less than that.

HIPPOLYTUS—On the authority of the Chronicon, ascribed to Hippolytus Portuensis, in the passage cited from it, as Alexander died Ol. 114. 1. B. C. 324, the Nativity is placed apparently B. C. 4. U. C. 750. But the author of the Chronicon speaks inaccurately; and the true date of the Nativity, as adopted by him, was U. C. 752. B. C. 2.

For he twice reckons it 206 years from the Passion to the thirteenth of Alexander Severus; which thirteenth expired March 11, U. C. 988. Two hundred and six years before that go back to U. C. 782. And he twice reckons it thirty years from the Nativity to the Passion; which last being dated U. C. 782, the Nativity is dated U. C. 752. He reckons fifty-nine Olympiads, or 236 years, *a Christo usque annum xiii Imperii Alexandri*; and from B. C. 2, or U. C. 752, 236 years bring us to A. D. 235, U. C. 988. But it is unnecessary to multiply the proofs of this position. It is more important to observe that the author of the Chronicle places the Nativity at the time of the Jewish Passover; that is, in the spring: a conclusion obviously to be collected from such passages as these: *Post Hezram, servatoris usque generationes Christi . . . Pascha fit—A generatione autem Christi, post triginta*

annos, cum passus est Dominus, Pascha celebratur: ipse enim erat justum Pascha.

The Chronicon in question is, as I think, with reason supposed to be a Latin version, or abstract of the Chronicon of Hippolytus, bishop of Portus Romanus*, and martyr, who was a contemporary of Alexander Severus; and the author of a chronological work which ended at the beginning of his reign^r.

If there were any doubt upon this point, it would contribute greatly to remove it, that the testimony of a genuine document, which is commonly ascribed to Hippolytus, may be shewn to agree with the Chronicle in both these respects; both that of placing the birth of Christ in the spring, U. C. 752, and that of dating the Passion in the spring, U. C. 782, just thirty years afterwards. The document in question is the Paschali-um, or Paschal Calendar, which was found inscribed upon a marble, discovered A. D. 1551: the nature of which, after all that has been written about it, is pro-

* Portus (Romanus) is described by Procopius, *De Bello Gotthico*, i. 26. about A. D. 537, as a city formerly of considerable consequence, and still of importance, situated over against Ostia, on the right bank of the Tyber, as Ostia was on the left; each at the mouth of the river, and each 126 stades from Rome. Cf. also cap. 27. Hippolytus was most probably bishop of this place. At an earlier period, speaking of the siege of Rome by Alaric, A. D. 408-410. Sozomen (ix. 6. 807. D.) represents the Portus, as the *ἐπίγειον* of the Romans, where the necessities

(ἐπιτήδεια) imported for the use of the city were first received and stored. Cf. cap. 8. 809. C. Philostorgius, in reference to the same occasion, xii. 3. 533. B. says of Alaric, ὁ δὲ θάπτον καταλαμβάνει τὸν Πόρτον· μέγιστον δὲ οὗτος νεώριον Ῥώμης, λιμέσι τρισὶ περιγραφόμενος, καὶ εἰς πόλεως μικρᾶς παρατεινόμενος μέγεθος. ἐν τούτῳ δὲ ὁ δημόσιος ἅπας σίτος κατὰ παλαιὸν ἔθος ἐταμιεύετο. Such a place would probably have a bishop. Apolinarius, apud *Scriptorum Deperditorum Vaticanam Collectionem*, i. Comm. Varr. in Daniele, 173. F. calls Hippolytus, bishop of Rome.

^r Eusebius, E. H. vi. 22. Hieronymus, *De SS. Ecclesiasticis*, 61. *Operum* iv. pars ii^a, 117.

bably too well known to the learned world to require any further description ^s.

It is sufficient to observe that this calendar consists of a double octaëteric cycle ; and is so constructed as to shew the days of the month, and the days of the week, on which the paschal full moons would fall for a period of 16×7 or 112 years, either backwards or forwards, as dated from their proper ἀρχή, which is laid in the first year of Alexander Severus, A. D. 222—when the paschal full moon is said to have fallen upon the Ides of April, April 13, and April 13 on the seventh day of the week. The reason of this is, that in a cycle of sixteen years, though the full moons may be supposed, at the end of it, to recur on the same days of the month as before, they do not return to the same day of the week ; but in each instance they fall out one day earlier than they did sixteen years before. In seven cycles, then, of sixteen years, that is in 112 years in all, they will come back to the same days of the week as at first ; but not sooner.

On this principle, and so far as the accuracy of such a calendar can be depended upon—if we have ascertained the dates of sixteen paschal full moons in order, from any given year, any one of those dates may be supposed to hold good again at the distance of 112 years, or of any number of years which is an exact multiple of 112—either backwards or forwards. And such being the nature of the application of the cycle, we are furnished by it with a clue to the meaning of certain marginal references, which are found to be annexed to some of the full moons in the several columns of the cycle, but not to all.

It was the opinion of Scaliger that these were in-

^s Vide Hippolyti Opera, i. 38. et seqq.

tended to point out the lessons, from the Old or the New Testament, which in the time of Hippolytus were ordered to be read at the periods in question: for the refutation of which opinion it is abundantly sufficient to refer to Blanchini's elaborate dissertation on the cycle, as it is inserted in Fabricius' edition of the works of Hippolytus, *loc. cit.* The truth is, the references in question were designed to indicate the dates of certain former passovers, which had occurred 224 years, or any number of years, an exact multiple of 112, before that date in the cycle to which these references are found annexed.

One of these references stands annexed to the date of the paschal full moon, Wednesday, April 2, in the second year of the first sedecennity, or column of sixteen years, in the words Γένεσις Χρίστου: and another stands parallel with the date of the paschal full moon, Friday, March 25, in the last year of the second sedecennity or column, in the words Πάθος Χρίστου. Between these dates the interval from passover to passover is thirty years exactly; which is also the interval supposed by the author of the Latin Chronicon before described, between the Nativity, in the spring, U. C. 752, and the Passion, in the spring, U. C. 782.

I understand the second of these indications to mean that the Πάθος Χρίστου, or Passion of Christ, happened on Friday, March 25, 224 years exactly before the same day of the month and the week, in the thirty-second year of the cycle; which cycle bearing date from Saturday the 13th of April, A. D. 222, U. C. 975, this day, in its thirty-second year, answers to Friday, March 25, U. C. 1006. From this time, U. C. 1006, 224 years backwards bring us to the same time, U. C. 782, as the year of the Passion of Christ.

In like manner, the former indication, Γένεσις Χρίστου,

annexed to the paschal full moon, Wednesday, April 2, in the second year of the cycle, A. D. 223, or U. C. 976, is intended to shew that the same paschal moon happened 224 years before, at the nativity of Christ. The Nativity is thus placed, U. C. 752, B. C. 2. And not only so—but as the words Πάθος Χρίστου, in the second instance, plainly imply that the death of Christ was actually to be placed on Friday, March 25, U. C. 782, so must the words Γένεσις Χρίστου in the first instance, as plainly intimate that the birth of Christ, in the opinion of Hippolytus, actually happened on Wednesday, April 2, U. C. 752.

The testimony of Hippolytus, therefore, is to be added to that of the other authorities, which shew that, at this early period, the common opinion placed the Nativity in the spring, at the time of the Jewish passover itself. The coincidence, at least, between the testimony of his canon, and that of the author, *De Computo Paschali*, which terminates only five years later, is striking, and may justly be appealed to in confirmation of the preceding exposition. The latter places the Nativity on a Wednesday, as well as this.

It is no objection to the truth of the above explanation of the calendar, that the application of the cycle in question is liable to error for periods even of sixteen years; and much more for periods of 112 or 224 years. It is not the case, for example, that the same paschal full moon, which, U. C. 976, happened on April 2, fell previously on the same day, U. C. 752. If it happened at all, it happened the year before, U. C. 751: and so in the other instance, that of the paschal full moon, U. C. 1006. If that ever occurred before, it was U. C. 781: not U. C. 782.

Nor is it any objection that (*Reliquiæ Sacræ*, i. 136. Annott. in Melitonis fragm. p. 115) a fragment is quoted

and referred to Hippolytus, which places the Nativity A. M. 5500, and the Passion A. M. 5533. This fragment would be directly at variance with the Latin Chronicle and with the canon. But Hippolytus Thebanus, or the younger, did certainly suppose the Nativity A. M. 5500, and the Passion A. M. 5533. It is probable therefore that the fragment really belongs to him, and is by mistake only ascribed to Hippolytus Portuensis.

ARCHELAUS—Nec in aliquo remoratus Dominus noster Jesus, intra unius anni spatium languentium multitudines reddidit sanitati, mortuos luci—Archelai et Manetis disputatio, cap. 34^t.

Ut autem credas; cum Discipuli ejus per annum integrum manserunt cum eo, quare nullus ipsorum procidit super faciem suam, sicut paulo ante dicebas, sed in una hora illa, quando sicut sol resplenduit vultus ejus? Ibid. 50^u.

The rise of the Manichean heresy is placed by Cyril of Jerusalem, ἐπὶ Πρόβου βασιλείῳς, exactly seventy years before his own time^x. Probus' reign bears date A. D. 276: and he was consul first, A. D. 277. In another passage he says the apostles died two hundred years before the time of Manes^y. And hence we are enabled to correct a note of time which appears in the Disputatio itself: Qui enim dixerat se non multo post misurum esse Paraclitum, invenitur post *trecentos* (*rescribe ducentos*) et eo amplius annos misisse hunc, sicut ipse sibi testimonium perhibet^z*. That the dis-

* Epiphanius, i. 617. C. Manichæi, i. dates the rise of this sect in the fourth of Aurelian: i. 636. C—638. B. he reckons it 276 years according to some, and 246 according to others,

^t Reliquiæ Sacræ, iv. 218. Archelaus was bishop of Caschara in Mesopotamia, Socrates, E. H. i. xxii. 56. D. ^u Ibid. 264. ^x Catechesis vi. 12. l. 26. Cf. iv. 22. p. 67. l. 1. Also vi. capp. 13—18. ^y Catechesis xvi. 4. p. 228. l. 4. ^z Caput 27. p. 201.

putation was held in the reign of Probus, appears from capp. 27 and 28^a. Cf. Jerome, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, lxxii. *Operum* iv. Pars ii^a. 120.

ARNOBIUS—Trecenti sunt anni ferme, minus vel plus aliquid, ex quo cœpimus esse Christiani, et terrarum in orbe censi. Arnobius, *Adversus Gentes*, i. p. 9. l. 2.

Ætatis urbs Roma cujus esse in annalibus indicitur? annos ducit quinquaginta et mille, aut non multum ab his minus. *Ibid.* ii. 94. l. 24.

from the Ascension, to the time of Manes, Aurelian, and Probus. The former of these dates might hold good, if referred to the Nativity; the latter, if to the Passion: Cf. 698. B. lxxvii. *Operum* ii. 176. A. *De Mensuris et Ponderibus*, xx: he dates the *Disputatio* of Manes and Archelaus in the ninth of Valerian and Gallienus. Suidas, under *Μάνης*, places the appearance of Manes in the reign of Aurelian: but in the fragment relating to Nerva (*Νέρβας*) he dates it under Nerva, at the time of St. John's return from banishment. Probably in this last instance he has confounded Manes with Cerinthus. The *Paschal Chronicle* has the same statement, i. 469. l. 10. Jerome, in *Chronico*, fixes the rise of Manichæanism to the second of Probus; both by other criteria, and by specifying the synchronism of *Æræ Antiochenæ* 325, coincident with it. *Æræ Antiochenæ* 325 would expire, October, U. C. 1030, which was actually the second of Probus. Eusebius' *Armenian Chronicle* has the same date generally with Jerome. Cassiodorus, in *Chronico*, dates

it A. D. 282, in the last year of Probus. Julius Pollux, 242, 244, dates the rise of this heresy under Probus or Carus: adding a Scholium, giving an account of the sect, its founder, and distinctive peculiarities, which is very like what occurs on the same subject in Socrates, E. H. i. xxii. 55. Eusebius, E. H. vii. xxxi. 283. places it generally about the beginning of the reign of Diocletian: and that it was actually of recent date, about that time, may be inferred from the exordium of one of his Constitutions, which occurs in the commentary on St. Paul's Epistles ascribed to Ambrose, *Operum* ii. Appendix, 310. C. in *Secundam ad Timotheum*, iii. 6, 7: Quippe cum Diocletianus Imperator constitutione sua designet, dicens: Sordidam hanc et impuram hæresim, quæ nuper, inquit, egressa est de Perside. Manichæanism had spread very generally by A. D. 355, in the reign of Constantius. See Ammianus Marcellinus, xv. 13. A. D. 355. and Cf. Socrates, E. H. ii. xxviii. 119. B. and Theodorit, ii. xiv. 88, 89. A. D. 350.

The age of Arnobius, therefore, is about U. C. 1050. A. D. 297 : for he follows the Varronian computation : (cf. also lib. vii. 232. l. 7 :) and consequently his date for the beginning of Christianity is about U. C. 750. B. C. 4. Jerome, in *Chronico*, places his acme in the twentieth of Constantine, A. D. 325, or 326.

EUSEBIUS—Ἱστορεῖται δὲ ὁ πᾶς τῆς διδασκαλίας καὶ παραδοξοποιίας ὁμοῦ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν χρόνος τριῶν ἡμισυ γεγονώς ἐτῶν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐβδομάδος ἡμισυ. τοῦτό πως Ἰωάννης ὁ Εὐαγγελιστὴς ἀκριβῶς ἐφιστᾷσιν αὐτοῦ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ παραστήσει. εἴη ἂν οὖν ἐβδομᾶς ἐτῶν μία ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ συνδιατριβῆς, ὃ τε πρὸ τοῦ πάθους, καὶ ὁ μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῦ. πρὸ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ πάθους ἐπὶ τρία καὶ ἡμισυ ἔτη τοῖς πᾶσιν ἑαυτὸν παρέχων, μαθηταῖς τε καὶ τοῖς μὴ τοιούτοις, ἀναγέγραπται μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, τὸν ἴσον, ὡς εἰκὸς, τῶν ἐτῶν χρόνον τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις συνῆν, δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα ὀπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς καὶ συναλιζόμενος, καὶ λέγων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς γοῦν αἱ πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων περιέχουσιν. *Demonstratio Evangelica*, viii. 400. B.

If Eusebius did not mean, in this passage, to assert that there was an interval of half a week, or three years and six months, between the resurrection and the ascension, it must be confessed that he has expressed himself very obscurely. Nor is much light reflected on this obscurity by the commentary of Jerome on Daniel ix, who has occasion to quote his opinion, among other expositions of the prophecy of the seventy weeks ^b.

His meaning, however, may probably be collected from Theodorit ^c, who assigns a prophetic week to the period between the commencement of our Lord's

^b Operum iii. 1111—1113 *ad medium*—1114 *ad principium*.
1245—1250—52. in Dan. ix.

^c Operum ii.

personal ministry, and the stoning of Stephen: allowing three years and an half to the duration of that ministry, and another three years and an half to the remaining interval, after which the apostles ceased to preach exclusively to the Jews, and began to preach to the rest of the world. The beginning of our Lord's ministry the same writer dates in the fifteenth of Tiberius, U.C. 782; and therefore its close in the eighteenth or nineteenth, U.C. 785 or 786: and he specifies his own age, immediately afterwards, as 440 years later, about U. C. 1226, A. D. 473*.

CYRILL OF JERUSALEM—'Εν γαστρὶ μὲν παρθένου γέγονεν ὁ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐννεαμηνιαῖος (ὁ) χρόνος· ἀνὴρ δὲ γέγονεν ὁ Κύριος τριάκοντα καὶ τρία ἔτη. Catechesis xii. 14. *ad finem*.

Cyrril, whose age, as we have seen, is about A. D. 340, thus estimates the length of our Lord's ministry at three years: for in another passage he supposes him to have been baptized at thirty^d. If the *Historia Ecclesiastica et Mystagogica*, ascribed to him, be really his, or represent his opinions rightly, he there places the Nativity A. M. 5500^e.

JULIANUS IMPERATOR—'Ο δὲ Ἰησοῦς, ἀναπείσας τὸ χεῖριστον τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν, ὀλίγους πρὸς τοῖς τριακοσίοις

* It is singular that Eusebius should maintain the whole duration of our Lord's ministry to have been three years and an half, yet tell us, that the three first Gospels contained only the particulars of one year; viz. that between the Baptism and the Passion; and the fourth Gospel only the particulars which

preceded the Baptism. See E. H. iii. 24. 95. C. & c. This interval of three years and an half between the Baptism and the Ascension, is recognised and assumed by Arethas, in Rev. xx. 7. apud Œcumenium, ii. 816. A. in one of the explanations of the Thousand years, there proposed.

^d Catechesis vi. 11. p. 90. l. 12.

^e Caput 18. p. 330.

ἐναντοῖς ὀνομάζεται, ἐργασάμενος παρ' ὃν ἔζη χρόνον ἔργον οὐδὲν ἀκοῆς ἄξιον, εἰ μὴ τις οἶεται τοὺς κυλλοὺς καὶ τυφλοὺς ἰάσασθαι, καὶ δαιμονῶντας ἐφορκίζειν, ἐν Βηθσαιδᾷ καὶ ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ταῖς κώμαις, τῶν μεγίστων ἔργων εἶναι. Julianus Imperator, apud Cyrillum, lib. vi. 191. D. E.

If it be true, as Jerome informs us, that this work of Julian's was written *in expeditione Persica*, its date was A. D. 362 or 363.

EPIPHANIUS—Epiphanius' date for the Nativity is viii Ides of January, (January 6,) in the forty-second of Augustus, U. C. 752, and in the thirty-third of Herod: for the visit of the Magi, and the flight into Egypt, it is two years later, in the thirty-fifth of Herod: for the Baptism, it is vi Ides of November, (November 8,) U. C. 781: for the Passion, it is xiii Kalends of April, March 20, U. C. 784: the age of our Lord at his Baptism, he supposes to be twenty-nine years and ten months exactly: his age at the Passion, thirty-two years and seventy-four days: and the precise length of his ministry, from his Baptism, November 8, U. C. 781, to his death, March 20, U. C. 784, to be two years, one hundred and thirty-four days. These things are so often asserted by him that it would be endless to refer to particular passages. Vide however, i. 432. A. Alogi, x—450. xxix: ii. 135. Anacephalæosis, cxxiii: 169. B. De Mensuris et Ponderibus, xii.

The mistake of Epiphanius in placing the birth of Christ in the thirty-third of Herod, four years before the death of that king, might possibly arise from his confounding together the two lengths of his reign, thirty-four years, and thirty-seven. Our Saviour, I believe, was actually born in the thirty-third of Herod, as dated from U. C. 717—one year before his death*.

* It appears from Arethas, in Rev. xii. 14. apud Œcumenium,

Another singular mistake of his, is, that though he certainly places the Passion U. C. 784, he places it Coss. Vinicio et Longino: and these were consuls U. C. 783. The true date of the Passion, I believe, to be this very consulate. Epiphanius, however, by a remarkable oversight, distinguishes the consulate of the two Gemini from that of Rufus and Rubellius, or rather Fusius and Rubellius, who were in reality the same persons. Hence, though he has made no mistake in his supposed year of the Passion, he has assigned it to the consuls of the year preceding.

The Ancoratus, we may observe, is quoted in the work *Adversus Hæreses*: 751. D. Ariani, xxvii: and 887. D. Pneumatomachi, ii. Otherwise they were written very near to each other, the date of the former being *Æræ Diocletianæ* 90, and that of the latter *Æræ Diocletianæ* 92. Vide ii. 1. B: 64. A. lx: 123. B. cxxi: and i. 2. C. D. caput ii: *Epistola ad Epiphanium*: 404. A. *Cataphrygastæ*, ii: 638. A. *Manichæi*, xx.

PRUDENTIUS—Quid est quod artum circum

Sol jam recurrens deserit?

Christusne terris nascitur

Qui lucis auget tramitem?

Heu quam fugacem gratiam

Festina volvebat dies!

Quam pæne subductam facem

Sensim recisa exstinxerat!

Coelum nitescit lætius,

Gratatur et gaudens humus:

ii. 757. B. C. that such commentators, as understood the woman travelling with child, in the Revelation, of the mother of our Lord, explained the three years and an half of her sojourn in the desert, after the birth of the child, of our Lord's, and the rest of the Holy Family's sojourn

in Egypt for the last three years and an half of the reign of Herod. The length of this sojourn in Egypt is also supposed to have been three years, in the *Apocryphal Evangelium Infantiae*, capp. xxv. xxvi. See the *Codex Apocryphus*, i. 187, 188.

Scandit gradatim denuo
Jubar priores lineas.

Prudentius^f, *Cathemerinon* xi. 1 : Hymnus ad viii. Kal. Jan. as some codices have it : *Natalis Domini*, as others.

Prudentius was born A. D. 348, and published these poems at fifty-seven : A. D. 404.

The Apostolical Constitutions, v. 13, fix the Nativity to the 25th of the ninth month, and the Epiphany to the 6th of the tenth. Augustin : *Deinde natus est Christus cum jam inciperent crescere dies : natus est Johannes quando cœperunt minui dies*^g ; that is, on Dec. 25 and June 24, respectively.

The latter writer considered our Lord's ministry to have lasted only one year ; which follows both from his placing the Passion Coss. Geminis, and from this passage in his Epistles^h : *A nativitate autem Domini hodie computantur anni ferme quadringenti viginti, a resurrectione autem vel adscensione ejus anni plus minus cccxc.* This places the Ascension thirty years after the Nativity ; and no more.

Ἑκατοστῇ ἐννενηκοστῇ τετάρτῃ Ὀλυμπιάδι, Ῥωμαίων Αὐγούστου Καίσαρος βασιλεύοντος, γεγέννηται κατὰ σάρκα ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. Cyrillus contra Julianum, lib. i. 14. A.

Olympiad 194 answers to B. C. 4—A. D. 1. U. C. 750—U. C. 754, and which of these years is meant must be doubtful.

The *πολιτεία* of Metrophanes and Alexander, apud Photium, *Bibliotheca*, Codex 256. p. 469. l. 17, places the persecution of Diocletian in the nineteenth of his reign, and anno Christi 305. This supposes the Na-

^f Operum i. 79. ^g Operum iii. Pars iia. 402. B. in Johannem Tractatus xiv. 5. Cf. v. 1152. E. Sermo 287. 4. ^h Operum ii. 748. E. F. Epistolæ, 199. 20. Cf. iii. 36. B. De Doctrina Christiana, ii. 42.

tivity to be two years before the vulgar era; viz. U.C. 752, or B.C. 2.

Τὸ δέ γε ἡμέτερον γένος, τὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν λέγω, πρὸ τετρακοσίων μὲν ἐτῶν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔσχευ—Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus, κατὰ εἰμαρμένης, apud Photii Bibliothecam, Codex 223. p. 218. l. 23.

Cassiodorus in *Chronicis* places the birth of Christ Augusti xli. Coss. Lentulo et Messala; both which dates, as he reckons the reign of Augustus at 56 years, coincide with U. C. 751.

The *Martyrium Pauli Apostoli*, prefixed to *Œcumenius* in *Novum Testamentum*, dates his martyrdom, at Rome, ἐπὶ Νέρωνος, on the fifth of the Syro-Macedonian Panemus, or Egyptian Epiphi, and the 29th of the Roman June, in the thirty-sixth year τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους, and the sixty-ninth year τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας: three hundred and thirty years before the date of the *Martyrium* itself, which is specified as the fourth consulate of Arcadius, and the third of Honorius, in the ninth year of the Roman Indiction.

According to the *Fasti*, the consulate in question was A. D. 396: and A. D. 396 was also the ninth year current of the Roman Indiction. On this principle, St. Paul's martyrdom must be dated, A. D. 396 *minus* 330, that is, A. D. 66, U. C. 819: our Saviour's Passion, A. D. 66 *minus* 36, A. D. 30. U. C. 783: and our Saviour's birth, U. C. 819 *minus* 69, U. C. 750, B. C. 4: dates, which, from whatever quarter obtained, yet according to the conclusions which we have laboured to establish in other parts of the present work, must be admitted to be remarkably correct.

It is proper, however, to observe, that the *Paschal Chronicon*, i. 566, has a remark on the year of the same consulate, which makes 335 years complete from

the martyrdom of Peter and Paul to the date in question. But the martyrdom of St. Peter as well as of St. Paul is alluded to there; and of the other synchronisms, specified above, nothing is said.

I may be allowed, perhaps, to embrace this opportunity of quoting from the *Evangelium Infantiae*, in the *Codex Apocryphus*, i. 169, a date which also places the Nativity U. C. 750. Caput ii. it is said, Anno autem trecentesimo nono æræ Alexandri edixit Augustus, ut describeretur unusquisque in patria sua. It then proceeds to speak of the Holy Family's repairing to Bethlehem, in obedience to this decree, and of Christ's being born there. The æra Alexandri there referred to, is the æra Seleucidarum: which bears date U. C. 442, B. C. 312. The 309th year of that æra would consequently begin to bear date U. C. 750, B. C. 4. It is observable that the same apocryphal work (see capp. ii. and iii.) placed the Nativity in the evening or night time.

The antiquity of this apocryphal production may entitle its testimony to some degree of weight, upon a mere matter of fact, like the above. There is reason to believe that the Greek original, from which the Arabic version was made, and through that, the *Evangelium Infantiae*, such as we have it translated in Fabricius' *Codex Apocryphus*, was known to Irenæus. See the *Prolegomena* of Fabricius: i. 128, and sqq.

ST. JOHN—If there is reason to suppose that the evangelist St. John was either of the same age with our Saviour, or not much younger than he, when he was called to be a disciple; the time of the birth of St. John, if that can be probably determined, will so far be an argument for the time of the birth of our Saviour.

That this apostle survived until the beginning of the reign of Trajan, is affirmed by a number of ancient and competent witnesses.

Irenæus twice asserts that St. John continued at Ephesus or in Asia, *μέχρι τῶν Τραϊανου χρόνων*^{*i}: and once that he saw the Apocalypse, *πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς*^k. Eusebius, *Chronicon Armeno-Latinum*, repeats the former statement after Irenæus, *ad annum Trajani 1*; but Jerome, in *Chronico*, *ad annum Trajani iii*: and both he and Jerome place the banishment of St. John, and the date of his Apocalypse, in the thirteenth or fourteenth of Domitian. Clemens Alexandrinus certainly bore a similar testimony; and by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History* he is said to have defined the precise year of Trajan, in his tractate, *Quisnam dives salvetur?* where however it does not occur; nor does Eusebius repeat it after him^l. There is still extant, in the works of Clement, a remarkable story concerning St. John, the authenticity of which I see no reason to question; and which Clement ushers in with the following words: *ἀκουσον μῦθον, οὐ μῦθον ἀλλὰ ὄντα λόγον, περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου παραδεδομένον καὶ μνήμη πεφυλαγμένον*^m. It is easy to collect from this narrative, that the fact re-

* Julius Pollux, *Chronicon*, 204, has a statement to this effect: *ἕως ἐβδόμου ἔτους Τραϊανου περιῆν ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης*: which is so connected with what immediately precedes in the context, as to seem to make part with that of a quotation from Irenæus. It is doubtful, how-

ever, whether Irenæus affirmed this particular fact. Certainly it does not occur in his extant remains. The *Paschal Chronicon*, as we shall see by and by, has the same date for the death of St. John: and probably both that and Pollux took it from a common authority.

ⁱ Lib. ii. xxxix. 161. l. 26: iii. iii. 205. l. 1.

Cf. Eusebius, iii. 18. 88. D. ^l E. H. iii. 23. 91. D. Cf. Syncellus, i. 653. l. 6. for both these testimonies. ^m *Operum* ii. 958. *Quis dives salvetur?* xlii. Cf. Eusebius, iii. 23. 91. &c. and Chrysostom, i. 30. E. 31. A. *Ad Theodorum Lapsus*, i. 16.

^k Lib. v. xxx. 449. l. 20.

corded could not have happened until some years at least, after St. John's return from banishment; (and that is supposed to be after the death of the tyrant Domitian;) and that St. John was then a very old man*.

Tertullian has not mentioned the time of St. John's return from banishment, or of his death; though he is the most ancient authority who asserts the fact of his being thrown into a caldron of boiling oil, before he was banishedⁿ: a statement also made by Jerome, but whether from Tertullian, does not appear^o †.

Origen simply attests that St. John was condemned by the Roman emperor to banishment at Patmos, and saw the Apocalypse while he was there^p.

The Acta of Timothy, the first bishop of Ephesus, of which Photius has preserved an abstract^q, place the martyrdom of Timothy towards the end of the reign of Domitian; the recall of St. John from banishment, under Nerva; and his death at Ephesus, in the reign of Trajan. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, bears abundant testimony to this latter fact; and that St. John

* His great age is likewise implied in the characteristic anecdote, related of him by Jerome, iv. Pars i. 314. *ad medium*, in Gal. vi.: *Beatus Johannes Evangelista, quum Ephesi moraretur usque ad ultimam senectutem; et vix inter discipulorum manus ad Ecclesiam deferretur, nec posset in plura vocem verba contexere, nihil aliud per singulas solebat proferre collectas, nisi*

hoc, Filioli, diligite alterutrum.

† Yet, *Operum* v. 16. *Apologeticus*, 5. the recall of St. John is placed by Tertullian virtually under the reign of Domitian. After speaking of Nero's persecution as the first of all—he continues, *Tentaverat et Domitianus, portio Neronis de crudelitate, sed qua et homo, facile cœptum repressit, restituit etiam quos relegaverat.*

ⁿ *Operum* ii. 46. *De Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum*, 36.

^o *Operum* iv. Pars i. 92. *ad calcem* in Matt. xx. Cf. however Pars ii^a. *Adversus Jovinianum* i. 169. *ad principium*, which quotes Tertullian for the fact.

A. In Matt. tom. xvi. 6. ^q Codex 254. p. 468.

^p *Operum* iii. 720.

both died and was buried at Ephesus^r: which is sufficient to discredit the tradition, however ancient, that he never died, but was translated like Enoch and Elijah.

Jerome, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*^s places his banishment in the fourteenth of Domitian; his return, under Nerva; and his death at Ephesus, sixty-eight years after the Passion. As Jerome's date for the Passion is U. C. 784, this places the death of St. John, U. C. 852, in the second of Trajan. The same dates appear in his *Chronicon*. In another passage also^t, which has been produced at length already^u, he mentions an opinion which included the half of a prophetic week, that is thirty-five years, between the commencement of the Jewish war under Nero, and the death of St. John, in the time of Trajan. From U. C. 819, thirty-five years would bring us to U. C. 854, in the fourth of Trajan.

Augustin reckons it 320 years to his own time, since the composition of that one of St. John's Epistles, which contained the declaration, *it is the last time*^x: and 420 years to the same time from the birth of Christ. On this principle, he supposed the epistle to have been written one hundred years after the birth of Christ: that is, as his date for the Nativity is U. C. 752, he dates the composition of the epistle, U. C. 852, and therefore considered St. John to be still living in the second of Trajan^y. He adds; *Huc accedit, quia inspecta diligenter ecclesiastica historia, reperitur Johannes apostolus longe ante fuisse defunctus, quam quinque millia quingenti anni a generis humani exordio complerentur.*

Theophylact's date for the Gospel of St. John, thirty-

^r Eusebius, E. H. iii. 31. 102. D.: v. 24. 191. C. ^s Cap. ix. Operum iv.
^t Operum iii.
^u Supra page 617. ^x 1 John ii. 18. ^y Operum ii.
 1114. in Dan. ix. 747. G. Epistolæ, 199. 18: 748. E. F. Ibid. 20.

two years after the Ascension, U.C. 784, would place its composition, U.C. 816: but if referred to the date of the destruction of Jerusalem, U.C. 823, it would place it U.C. 855, in the fifth of Trajan. Suidas, under the article *Ἰωάννης*, supposes the composition of the Gospel after his return from Patmos; when he was one hundred years old; and his death at one hundred and twenty*. The Paschal Chronicon places the banishment under Domitian; the recall in the first of Nerva; and the death in the seventh of Trajan, seventy-two years after the Ascension; when St. John was one hundred years and seven months old^z. As this Chronicon dates the Ascension U.C. 785, these two notes of time meet together in U.C. 857. Hippolytus, *περὶ τῶν ἱβ' ἀποστόλων*, makes St. John one hundred and six years old at his death^a. A fragment of Hippolytus the younger^b makes him one hundred and ten; though it places his death under Domitian.

To judge, therefore, from all these testimonies, it seems the most probable opinion that St. John survived until the second or third of Trajan at least; and that he was one hundred years old, and upwards, at the time of his death. In this case, he must have been born U.C. 751, or 752, and he would be a year or two younger

* So likewise the treatise ascribed to Chrysostom, (*Operum vii. Spuria*, 231. C. De S. Joanne Apostolo,) and Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre, (*Theophylact, Operum i. 500*,) from the former of which the passage in Suidas seems to have been copied. Dorotheus

places the banishment to Patmos in the reign of Trajan—though he mentions the opinion also which placed it under Domitian. The banishment Suidas (*Δομετιανός*) places under Domitian, the recall under Nerva: cf. also in *Νέρβας*.

^z i. 467. l. 20—470. l. 19. Cf. however, 461. l. 6. where he is supposed to have spent nine years in Ephesus, before his banishment, fifteen in Patmos, and twenty-six at Ephesus after his return; which is dated U.C. 822, in the first of Vespasian. Hence his death would be U.C. 848, in the fourteenth of Domitian; at the time when other authorities suppose him to have been banished.

^a *Operum i.*

^b *Ibid. 49.*

than our Lord; to which conclusion his history, so far as it is related, would *a priori* seem to conduct us. There is every reason to believe that he was the youngest of the apostles, and it is not improbable that he was even younger than our Saviour himself. The two traditions, of his death in the seventh of Trajan U. C. 857, and of his age, at the time, one hundred and six—would accord wonderfully with this conjecture; for he must have been born, in that case, U. C. 751, and have been just one year younger than our Lord.

Epiphanius, indeed, represents him to have been ninety years old, when he returned from banishment^c; but as he places his return under Claudius, this is so material an error as to discredit his testimony altogether*. Besides which, even he, in other parts of his works, asserts that St. John survived to the reign of Trajan^d. And, perhaps, his meaning in the former instance is simply this; that St. John composed his Gospel, after his return from banishment, at ninety years of age—that is, he was ninety at least when he wrote his Gospel, though not necessarily when he returned—for he speaks of several years being spent in Asia even after the return, yet before the composition of the Gospel.

This supposes, it is true, a ten years' interval between the composition of his Gospel and his death; an interval which would, perhaps, have been more correct of the time of his banishment and his death. For if he returned U. C. 849, in the year which Dio assigns to the recall of the exiles, under Nerva^e; and lived to

* Yet Hippolytus *περὶ τῶν ἑβδόκον ἀποστόλων* supposes the Gospel, as well as the Revelation, to have been composed in Patmos. Theophylact also supposes the same of the Gospel: i. 504. A. B.

^c i. 434. A. Alogi, xii: cf. 456. A. Ibid. xxxiii. ^d i. 149. A. Ebionæi, xxiv: 636. A. Manichæi, xix. ^e lxviii. i.

be one hundred and six years old in U.C. 857—he survived his return eight years, and his banishment, dated U.C. 847 or 848, nine or ten.

It is probable that his Gospel was composed in the third or fourth of Trajan; which Jerome seems to designate as the time of his death, perhaps because tradition had handed it down as the time of the composition of the Gospel. The fourth of Trajan, U.C. 854, would accord with the thirty-second year current from the date of the destruction of Jerusalem, U.C. 823.

The question of the time of the death of St. John is connected with that of the date of the martyrdoms of Ignatius and of Polycarp respectively: more especially with that of the former; which some authorities place so early as the eighth of Trajan, U.C. 858. This question will be discussed elsewhere. Some regard also is due, in considering the time of the death of St. John, to the historical anecdote respecting him and the heretic Cerinthus, according to Irenæus, on the traditional authority of Polycarp, (iii. iii. 204. Cf. Eusebius, E. H. iii. 28. 100. C. D.); or the heretic Ebion, according to Epiphanius (i. 148. Ebionæi, xxiv.) The antiquity of either of these heresiarchs is great enough for the circumstance in question to have happened early in the reign of Trajan*.

* There is a remarkable passage, respecting the date of the Apocalypse, and other circumstances in the history of St. John, which occurs in the commentary on Revelation, compiled by Arethas, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, from the work of Andreas, a more ancient bishop of the same see, and other authorities of equal antiquity: a

commentary appended to *Œcumenius in Novum Testamentum*.

Tom. ii. 713. D—714. A. in Rev. vii. 4. understanding the 144,000 there alluded to, of such of the Jews as were designed by the Divine Providence to escape from the calamities coming upon their unbelieving countrymen, the commentary proceeds: *οὗτω γὰρ ἡ ὑπὸ Πω-*

μαίων ἀπώλεια Ἰουδαίους κατελήφει, ὅτε καὶ οὗτος ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ἐχρησμοδεῖτο ταῦτα. καὶ οὐκ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ἀλλ' ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ, τῇ κατ' Ἐφεσον. μετὰ γὰρ τὸ πάθος τοῦ Κυρίου, δέκα καὶ τέσσαρα μόνα ἔτη προσήδρευσεν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ὅσα καὶ τὸ θεοδόχον τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου μητρὸς σκῆνος τῇ ἐγκαίρῳ ταύτῃ ζωῇ, μετὰ τὸ πάθος καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τοῦ ἀφθόρου τόκου αὐτῆς, διετηρήθη. ἥ καὶ συμπάρῃν αἵτε μητρί ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου αὐτῷ παραδεδομένη. μετὰ γὰρ τὴν ἀποβίωσιν ταύτης, οὐκ ἔτι τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐμφιλοχωρῆσαι, ἀλλὰ πρὸς Ἐφεσον μεταστῆναι αὐτὸν λόγος. καθ' ἣν, ὡς εἴρηται, καὶ τὰ τῆς προκειμένης Ἀποκαλύψεως ἐνεργηθῆναι, τῶν μελλόντων οὖσαν δῆλωσιν, καθ' ὅτι μετὰ τὸ τεσσαρακοστὸν ἔτος τῆς ἀναλήψεως τοῦ Κυρίου, κατὰ τῶν Ἑβραίων ἢ θλίψις συνηνέχθη.

It is here supposed that the date of the Apocalypse was prior to the destruction of Jerusalem; which, if that revelation was seen in Patmos, near the coast of Asia Minor, where Ephesus was situated, would imply that St. John was banished thither under Nero, not under Domitian: a conclusion contradictory to what is observed in this very commentary, in Rev. i. 9. ii. 654. D. of his being banished under Domitian (Cf. also, in Rev. iii. 10. ii. 682. C.) as well as refuted by the testimonies produced above, which unanimously assign the date of the Apocalypse to the latter end of the reign of Domitian.

By placing the destruction of Jerusalem forty years after the Ascension, this testimony dates the Ascension U. C. 783. A. D. 30, which, upon our principles, is correct. By supposing, too,

that St. John continued in Jerusalem fourteen years after the Ascension, without quitting it, it virtually confirms the tradition alluded to, Dissertation xv. vol. ii. 46, 47. that for fourteen years after the Ascension, the apostles as a body were not to leave Jerusalem. It virtually implies also that after the lapse of fourteen years, so spent in Jerusalem, they must all, or part of them, have begun to set out on their mission into other parts of the world; just as we assumed the commencement of Paul and Barnabas' first circuit to the Gentiles, A. D. 44. U. C. 797.

Whether St. John, in particular, at the end of the same period of time quitted Jerusalem, along with the rest, to preach elsewhere, is a question which we have not the means of determining. If he did, yet we may collect from Galatians ii. 1. that he must have again been present there, at the time of St. Paul's fourth visit, A. D. 52, twenty-two years after the Ascension. But whether he was also there at the time of the intermediate council, Acts xv. about A. D. 48. eighteen years after the same date, must be doubtful.

I cannot help thinking, indeed, that the true time when the apostle St. John may be supposed to have permanently quitted Judæa, is intimated at Galatians ii. 9; and that both he and St. Peter set out upon an evangelical circuit of the Roman empire, A. D. 52. in consequence of the arrangement made with St. Paul upon that occasion of their meeting in common in Jerusalem. Immediate-

ly after this meeting, we have evidence of St. Peter's preaching successively in Asia, Corinth, Rome, and Egypt; and it is to be presumed that St. John was not idle meanwhile, but preaching also either in the same parts or elsewhere, at the same time. Nor does it appear that either of these apostles was still at Jerusalem, A. D. 56, when St. Paul again visited it for the fifth time.

It would not follow from this fact, however, that the Virgin Mary in particular must have been still alive twenty-one or twenty-two years after the Ascension, A. D. 51 or 52. If she died about A. D. 44. fourteen years after the Ascension, she would still be sixty-three years old at her death; at least if the tradition alluded to elsewhere (Dissertation xvi. vol. ii. 88.) that she was fifteen or sixteen, at the time of the Annunciation, is founded in truth. The testimony of Arethas supposes her to have died a natural death. It knows nothing then of her fabled translation or assumption: which is so far an argument for its credibility. Confer the Extract from Modestus, bishop of Jerusalem, Photius, Codex 275, p. 511. l. 30.

There is no reason to suppose that any apostle, and much less the apostle St. John, had preached at Ephesus, before the beginning of St. Paul's residence there, A. D. 53. I should consider it very improbable even that any apostle had preached there, much more permanently taken up his abode there, up to the time of St. Paul's last Epistle to Timothy; written in the spring quarter of the year of his mar-

tyrdom, A. D. 66. On every account, the commencement of St. John's permanent residence at Ephesus, is to be dated later than the close of the personal history of St. Paul; as far as we have the means of tracing that history: though how much later, it may not be possible to say.

I should scarcely think it worth while to quote the Life of St. John by Symeon Metaphrastes, (Cf. Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre, apud Theophylact, i. 500,) as it abounds in fabulous particulars. Speaking of his examination before Domitian, and of his subsequent banishment to Patmos, Symeon is silent about the fact of his being previously thrown into the caldron of boiling oil. He asserts the composition of his Gospel in Patmos.

We may here add, that the supposed Epistle of Dionysius the Areopagite, Operum ii. 178, 179. Epistolæ, x. though it professes to be addressed to St. John, at that time in banishment, and residing in Patmos, throws no light on any of the above questions. It concludes with predicting merely his future restoration to liberty; a prediction for the credibility of which the writer claims to be considered an adequate voucher: ἀξιόπιστος δὲ πάντως εἰμὶ τὰ προεγνωσμένα σοι ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ μαθὼν καὶ λέγων, ὅτι καὶ τῆς ἐν Πάτμῳ φυλακῆς ἀφεθήσῃ, καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἀσιατίδα γῆν ἐπανήξεις, καὶ δράσεις ἐκεῖ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ Θεοῦ μισθήματα, καὶ τοῖς μετὰ σὲ παραδώσεις.

Maximus, in his Scholia on this Epistle, pp. 180, 181, institutes a calculation to prove that Dionysius was then about ninety years old; proceeding on the

supposition that he was twenty-five, in the eighteenth of Tiberius, when he observed the miraculous darkness (of which we have the account in the Epistle to Polycarp, Operum ii. 88. Epistolæ, vii. Cf. Dissertation xiv. vol. i. 468, 469.) and that this Epistle to St. John was written sixty-four years and seven months afterwards, in the last year of Domitian: such being the interval between the eight-

eenth of Tiberius, A. D. 32. *avere*, and the last year of Domitian, A. D. 96. *ab auctumno*. He quotes Irenæus and Clemens Alexandrinus, (*locis citatis*) to the fact of the banishment of St. John to Patmos in the reign of Domitian. Pachymeres, too, in his paraphrase of the Epistle, p. 184, supposes St. John banished about the last of Domitian, and released from exile in the first of Nerva.

APPENDIX.

DISSERTATION XIV.

On the date of the battle of Pharsalia.

Vide Dissertation xiv. vol. i. page 524. last line of note.

IT is not a new opinion that Cæsar reformed the calendar by the introduction of sixty-seven, and not of eighty-nine days. The same hypothesis was maintained by Guischard, in his controversy with De Lo-Looz ; and he has arranged the chronology of the intermediate period between the commencement of the civil war, U. C. 705, and the death of Cæsar, U. C. 710 ; in conformity to it^a.

It is observable, however, that while this gentleman supposed the battle of Pharsalia to have been fought on the ninth of August in the unrectified year ; he placed the death of Pompey on the twenty-ninth of September in the *same*. This was to introduce between the two events an interval of forty-nine or fifty days : a supposition too improbable to be for a moment entertained. The testimony of history is unanimous to the effect that the death of Pompey ensued upon the battle, with as little delay as the circumstances of the case would admit. A fortnight's interval is the utmost which can be supposed between these two events ; an interval of six or seven weeks is altogether incredible.

The proof of this assertion may be easily made out, if the reader will give me leave to trace the course of proceedings, from the time when Cæsar took the field against Pompey, with a little more minuteness than I

^a Vide the Preface to Oberlinus's Cæsar, page x.

before considered to be necessary: assuming only that U. C. 706, the year of the battle, was an ordinary intercalary year; and consequently that the nominal dates which occur before the proper time of the intercalation in that year, are sixty-seven days in advance of the true, and after it, are forty-four or forty-five.

Pridie nonas Januarias, Cæsar set sail from Brundisium^b; that is, January 4, in the year of Numa, U. C. 706; but October 29, in the rectified Julian year, U. C. 705.

Jamque hiems adpropinquabat; viz. longo interposito spatio^c, after his arrival on the opposite coast. This would be nominally February, U. C. 706, really December, U. C. 705.

Pompeius . . iter in hiberna . . habebat; that is at Dyrrhachium. Cæsar also was preparing *sub pellibus hiemare*^d, at the same place. We will suppose this was nominally the end of February, U. C. 706; but really the end of December, U. C. 705. The commencement of the winter season, that is, the ingress of the brumal quarter, which the rectified calendar dates from December 25, will coincide with this point of time.

After this, Multi jam menses transierant, et hiems jam præcipitaverat^e; yet Cæsar had not been joined by his troops from Brundisium. *Præcipitaverat* means here, *had drawn to a close*; as *præcipitat* in Virgil, means, *is drawing to a close*:

Et jam nox humida cælo

Præcipitat, suadentque cadentia sidera somnos*.

Æneid. ii. 8.

* Cf. Ciceronis Aratea Fragmenta, Apud Aratum, ii. 76, 77: Nam prope *præcipitante* li-

cebit visere nocte, | Ut sese emergens ostendat Scorpius alto. The original, *Phænomena*, 303,

^b B. C. iii. 6.

^c Ibid. 9.

^d Ibid. II. 13.

^e Ibid. 25.

So Ovid, *Tristium* i. iii. 47.

Jamque moræ spatium nox præcipitata negabat,
Versaque ab axe suo Parrhasis Arctos erat.

Servius, *Ad Georgic.* i. 43: Nam anni quatuor sunt tempora, divisa in ternos menses: qui ipsorum temporum talem faciunt discretionem: ut primo mense Veris novum dicatur Ver: secundo, adultum: tertio, præceps. sicut etiam Sallustius dicit ubique: *nova æstas, adulta, præceps.* sic Autumnus novus, adultus, præceps. item Hyems nova, adulta, præceps vel extrema *^f.

Many months cannot well denote less than three or four since Cæsar first set out; which, combined with the signification of *præcipitaverat*, must imply that the spring quarter was arrived, or at hand. If U. C. 706, therefore, was intercalary, the course of events since Cæsar's departure from Brundisium, is brought nominally to the end of the intercalary month *Merkedonius* at least, if not into the ensuing March.

It makes in favour of this conclusion that the same chapter tells us, *Sæpe flaverant venti, quibus necessario committendum existimabat.* These winds would be south, or south-west, the time of whose blowing was commonly the beginning of spring^g. When An-

304, stands as follows: σῆμα δέ τοι κείνης ὥρης καὶ μηνὸς ἐκείνου, | Σκορπίος ἀντέλλων εἷη πυμάτης ἐπὶ νυκτός. Again, *loco citato*, Nam Canis infesto sequitur vestigia cursu, | *Præcipitantem* agitans oriens. Where also the *Phænomena*, 339, has, αὐτὰρ ὅγ' αἰεὶ | Σείριος ἐξόπιθεν φέρεται μετιόντι ἑοικώς, | καὶ οἱ ἐπαντέλλει, καὶ μιν κατιόντα διώκει. In another passage of the same *Fragmenta*, l. 348, the verb is used actively with its proper case: Quæ simul existant cernes, quæ tempore eodem

| *Præcipitent* obitum nocturno tempore nosces. The same idiom occurs repeatedly in Ammianus Marcellinus; though his Latin is not to be quoted as the most classical specimen of the language.

* Frontonis Opera inedita, pars i. p. 69. Epp. ad Marcum Cæsarem, lib. ii. 1: Id vespera et concubia nocte, dum se intempesta nox, ut ait M. Porcius, *præcipitat*, eodem modo perseverat.

^f Cf. ad *Æneid.* iii. 8: v. 295.

^g Pliny, *H. N.* ii. 47.

tony and Kalenus had at last set sail with the fleet, *nacti austrum*, and were just arrived off the opposite coast of Epirus . . . *idem auster increbuit . . . auster, qui per biduum flaverat, in africum se vertit*^h.

There was a certain time in every year, at which the sea was considered to become shut; and another, equally well defined, when it was considered to become open. These two periods Vegetius, *De Re Militari*ⁱ, distinguishes by the setting of the Pleiads, November 11, on the one hand, and the vi Ides of March, as the earliest point of time—or the rising of the Pleiads, April 2, or May 10, or 13, or 27, on the other^k. This last time in the Athenian year was in the month Munychion; which partly corresponded to March. Demosthenes : αἱ δὲ λήξεις τῶν δικῶν τοῖς ἐμπόροις ἔμμηνοί εἰσιν, ἀπὸ τοῦ βοηδρομιῶνος μέχρι τοῦ μουνυχιῶνος, ἵνα παραχρῆμα τῶν δικαίων τυχόντες ἀνάγονται^l. And again : μουνυχιῶνος μηνὸς μέλλων ἐκπλεῖν τὸν ὕστερον ἔκπλουν^m. But testimonies to this point will be produced abundantly elsewhereⁿ. The effect of them all is to render it almost certain, that, in the ordinary course of things, Cæsar could not expect to be joined by his fleet, before the middle of March in the tropical year.

The events between this junction, and the commencement of the siege of Dyrrhachium^o, will bring us at least to the end of March truly; but to the middle of May, forty-five days later, nominally. The siege would consequently begin about the first of April.

Jamque frumenta maturescere incipiebant^p. Theophrastus : ὥραι δὲ τοῦ σπόρου τῶν πλείστων δύο. πρώτη δὲ καὶ μάλιστα ἡ περὶ πλειάδων δύσιν^q : which in the Julian year would be about November 11. The grain so

^h B. C. iii. 26. ⁱ Lib. v. 9.
H. N. ii. 47. ^l Oratio xxxiii. 29.
to Dissertation xix. Appendix.

^q Historia Plantarum, viii. 1. p. 152.

^k Cf. Ovid, Fasti, iv. 169. v. 599. Pliny,
^m xlix. 7. Cf. 52. ⁿ Vide the notes

^o Lib. iii. 30—43.

^p Lib. iii. 49.

sown he supposes to ripen, *περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, παρὰ τοῖς πλείστοις* (κριθαὶ μὲν ἐν) ὀγδόῳ (June). *πυροὶ δὲ ἔτι προσ-επιλαμβάνουσιν*^r, (July or August.) Pliny repeats these statements *verbatim* after him^s.

On this principle, the corn in Epirus, as we may presume, would not ordinarily be ripe before July or August, nor begin to ripen before the middle of June: and this I should consider to be the time here implied*. The same conclusion follows from the allusion to the *æstus*, or summer heats, as drying up the springs: and from the fact that the various kinds of seeds which Pompey's troops had sown within their own entrenchments, to provide fodder for their horses, were both grown up and consumed^x.

Cæsar breaks up his camp before Dyrrhachium^y; when the siege had lasted, according to Suetonius, *per quatuor pæne menses*^z. If it began about the commencement of April, it would be raised about the middle of July.

From subsequent notes of time^a, we may safely infer that a week afterwards elapsed before he began

* *Sed patitur sævam, veluti circumdatus arcta | Obsidione famem, nondum surgentibus altam | In segetem culmis.* Lucan, *Pharsalia*, vi. 108. which describes the situation of Cæsar's troops during the siege.

When Cæsar was in Spain the year before, contending with Afranius and Petreius, we find him observing^t, *Tempus erat anni difficillimum, quo neque frumenta in hibernis erant, neque multum a maturitate ab-*

erant. Now from the speech of Curio to his troops in Africa^u, it appears that Cæsar was not forty days in Spain after his arrival there, before he was master of the whole province. The ancient kalendars place this reduction August 2. Hence the *tempus difficillimum* in question would be about the second or third week in July. The years U. C. 705 and 706 were not forward years, but quite the reverse.

^r *Historia Plantarum*, viii. 3. 155. ^s H. N. xviii. 10. §. 1. 6. Cf. Philo Judæus, i. 28. l. 17. De Mundi Opificio: Hesiod, *Opera et Dies*, 381—385. 562—575: Virgil, *Georgica*, i. 219—226. ^t B. C. i. 48. ^u ii. 32. ^x iii. 49. 58. ^y iii. 75. ^z Julius Cæsar, 35. ^a B. C. iii. 76—79.

his march from Apollonia to Thessaly. This then would be about the third week in July.

When he was arrived at Gomphi^b, there is an allusion to an embassy, which the Thessalians had sent to him *paucis ante mensibus*. They sent it, soon after the junction of Antony with the troops from Brundisium^c, three or four months previously.

From Gomphi he marched to Metropolis, and thence to the plains of Pharsalia : *Segetis idoneum locum in agris nactus, quæ prope jam matura erat*^d. He would arrive about the end of July.

Re frumentaria præparata . . . et satis longo spatio temporis a Dyrrhachinis præliis intermisso^e. This spatio temporis could scarcely be less than three weeks or a month^f. It appears, accordingly, from Cicero, *De Divinatione*, compared with the other authorities in the margin, that there was thirty days' interval, or upwards, between Pompey's departure from Dyrrhachium, (where Cicero was left behind,) and the time of the battle^g *.

It is not inconsistent with the conclusions thus established, that Plutarch tells us, at the time of the battle, *ἦν μὲν ἀκμῇ θέρους καὶ καὶ πολὺ*^h: for this might truly be said of the first week in August. Among the other prodigies which preceded the departure of Pompey in pursuit of Cæsar, Lucan mentions the circum-

* Lucan indeed supposes that Cicero was present at Pharsalia the day before the battle; and ascribes to him the speech which determined Pompey to engage: vii. 62. seqq. But herein, he is

certainly mistaken: for Cicero was prevented by illness from following Pompey; and was still at Dyrrhachium when news arrived of his defeat. Plutarch, Cicero, 39.

^b B. C. iii. 80. ^c Ibid. 34. ^d Ibid. 80, 81. ^e Ibid. 84. ^f Cf. Ap-
pian, *Bell. Civ.* ii. 64. ^g *De Divinatione*, i. 32. ii. 55. Cæsar, *De B. Civ.*
iii. 5. Cicero, *Epp. ad Att.* viii. 12. xi. 6, 7. Frontinus, *Strategematum* ii. 7.
^h Brutus, 4.

stance of a swarm of bees settling on the standards of his army.

Necnon innumero cooperta examine signa. vii. 161.

In which he is historically correct; as the same things are enumerated by Valerius Maximusⁱ, who wrote in the reign of Tiberius. And this too is a circumstance which might happen in the month of July or August. Nor must we omit to notice the sarcastic remark, attributed to Favonius: *εἰ μὴδὲ τῆτες ἔσται τῶν περὶ Τουσκλάνον ἀπολαῦσαι συκῶν*^k. We may learn from Horace, that figs would not be ripe in Italy before the first week in September:

Dum ficus prima, calorque

Designatorem decorat lictoribus atris^l.

Epistolarum i. vii. 5. See line 2.

It appears also that the Comitia Consularia and Prætorialia were at hand when Pompey arrived at Pharsalia^m: the time of which, though now very irregularly observed, was commonly August, September, or October*.

The battle was begun in the morning, and over by noon^o: so that Pompey had time sufficient to escape to Larissa the same night, and thence to the sea. Upon this point authorities are unanimous^p. Cæsar himself followed to Larissa the next day^q.

* Lucan, who is as much an historian as a poet, speaks of the corn's being scarcely ripe even when Pompey was come into Thessaly. *Ad præmaturas segetum jejuna rapinas | Agmina compulimus*. Lib. vii. 98. And on the very day of the battle, he says; *Illo forte die Cæsar statione relicta, | Ad segetum raptus moturus signa*. Ibid. 235.

And so Cæsar states himself, lib. iii. 85. It appears from Ciceroⁿ, that he himself returned to Italy after the battle with no delay: and was arrived at Brundisium *before pridie nonas Novembres*. And this too would be an argument that the date of the battle could not have been earlier than the latter end of September.

ⁱ Lib. i. vi. 12. ^k Plutarch, Cæsar, 41. Pompeius, 67. ^l Cf. Sermonum, ii. vi. 19. Epistolæ, i. xvi. 16. ^m B. C. iii. 82. ⁿ Ad Fam. vii. 3. xv. 15. xiv. 12. ^o B. C. iii. 95, 96. ^p Valerius Maximus, iv. v. 5: Lucan, vii. 712 —723: Appian, B. C. ii. 81. ^q B. C. iii. 98.

In one or two days after the battle Pompey appears to have arrived at Amphipolis; and that in the evening. He remained there *ad ancoram una nocte*, and then sailed *paucis diebus* to Mitylene^r. These *pauci dies* may be referred to the date of the departure from Larissa, and might reach from the night of September 22 exclusive, to September 25 or 26.

Biduum, he is said to have stayed at Mitylene: and from thence he sailed first to Cilicia, and afterwards to Paphus in Cyprus^s.

The account, however, of his motions which is given by Lucan is something different from this. He specifies his coming to Larissa, but he supposes him to escape thence, without delay, to the mouth of the Peneus, and sail directly to Mitylene^t. From Lesbos he supposes him to depart, without staying a single night; exactly at sunset^u. Before the next morning he had already passed Chius^v: after which, pursuing the usual route, he is taken without intermission by Samos, Cos, Gnidos, and Rhodes, to Phaselis in Lycia, and thence to Selinus in Cilicia, or rather to Synedra or Syedra, its seaport:

Quo portu mittitque rates recipitque Selinus^x.

Here that deliberation is supposed to take place which was followed by his departure to Egypt. Yet Lucan also makes him touch at Paphus.

Tunc Cilicum liquere solum, Cyproque citatas
Immisere rates, nullas cui prætulit aras
Undæ Diva memor Paphiæ^y.

From Lesbos to Pelusium in Egypt, we need not reckon it more than five or six days' and nights' sail,

^r B. C. iii. 102. ^s Cf. Cicero, Philippica, ii. 15; Valerius Maximus, i. v. 6.
^t Lib. viii. 1—5. 33—40. ^u Ibid. 109. 113. 146. 159. ^v viii. 195. 202.
^x Ibid. 244—251—260. ^y Ibid. 456.

even by Cilicia and Cyprus^z *. Appian asserts that Cæsar, in pursuit of Pompey, arrived at Alexandria, from Rhodes, which was more distant than Cyprus, on the *third* day after his departure, which took place at evening; having consequently been only two days and three nights complete, on the road^a. Lucan, likewise, describes his motions to the same effect, beginning with the Hellespont.

Sic fatus, repetit classes, et tota secundis
Vela dedit Coris, avidusque urgente procella
Iliacas pensare moras, Asiamque potentem
Prævehitur, pelagoque Rhodon spumante relinquit.
Septima nox Zephyro nunquam laxante rudentes,
Ostendit Phariis Ægyptia littora flammis.

Lib. ix. 1000—1005.

which supposes that he was only six days and seven nights at the utmost, in sailing from the Hellespont to Egypt. Even this is too liberal an allowance, if the statement of Appian be true. It must be remembered, however, that after August 9, the Etesian winds would be blowing; as Lucan indeed supposes, by the allusion to the Cori; and would facilitate both the escape of Pompey, and the pursuit of Cæsar. If the former, therefore, had left Mitylene on the evening of September 25 or 26, he might still be at Pelusium in Egypt, on or before October 1.

Authorities, as we saw before, are divided as to the exact date of the day of his death; some placing it on his birthday, some the day before, and some the day after†. It is observable, however, that Cicero, often

* Evagrius, E. H. ii. v. 295. D. mentions an instance, in which a band of two thousand soldiers, dispatched from Constantinople to Alexandria, in the reign of the emperor Marcian,

not long after the council of Chalcedon, A. D. 452. arrived at their destination on the sixth day after they set sail.

† This discrepancy might be occasioned by the difference in

^z Diodorus Sic. iii. 33: Strabo, xiv. 4. §. 2. 672: 6. §. 3. 746: Plutarch, Pompeius, 76. ^a Bell. Civil. ii. 89.

as he alludes to the fact of his death, is silent about any such coincidence as that of his perishing on his birthday^b. The same is true of Lucan. We may conclude, then, that he died sometime about his birthday, or when he was fifty-eight complete^c, which was certainly the case; though not necessarily upon the identical day. The true date of his death might thus be October 1: which would also be the day of his arrival; for it is agreed that he perished on the same day that he came*.

The Etesian winds were still blowing after Cæsar's arrival at Alexandria^d: and as they were commonly supposed to blow forty or forty-five days from the middle of July, they would continue to blow until the end of August. When the Alexandrine war had been sometime going on, the Etesian winds were blowing no longer, but instead of them an east wind^e; yet not a south, by which they were frequently succeeded. Not long after the beginning of the war it is said^f; *Namque eum, interclusum tempestatibus propter anni tempus, recipere transmarina auxilia non posse*: which implies that the sea was considered to be shut; and therefore that the autumnal equinox, at least, was

the length of the month of September in the year of Numa, and in that of Julius Cæsar, respectively: which was one day. If Pompey was born *pridie Kal. Oct.* in the year of Numa, his birthday was September 29. But this might be confounded with *pridie Kalendas Oct.* in the year of Cæsar; and that was September 30.

* *Ad Atticum*, xi. 6. Cicero had heard of the death of Pompey,

while he was still at Brundisium, *iv Kal. Dec.* from Diocharès, as it seems, Cæsar's freedman, who might have been sent to carry the news of it officially to Rome. And if he had left Egypt about the beginning of October, then at the usual rate of travelling, it might take him six weeks or two months to arrive in Italy. Cf. *Dio*, xlii. 18—20.

^b Vide *De Divinatione*, ii. 9. in particular. ^c *Dio*, xlii. 5. *Appian*, B. C. ii. 86. *Plutarch*, *Pompeius*, 64. ^d *B. Civ.* iii. 107. ^e *Bell. Alex.* 9. 11. ^f *Ibid.* 3.

past. The annual inundation of the Nile too was over^g; and this would not be the case before the same period in general. The Alexandrine war, then, appears to have been begun towards the end of the Julian September, U. C. 706.

The submission of Alexandria, itself, which would be virtually the close of the contest, is dated by the calendars March 6, U. C. 707*. But the entire duration of Cæsar's residence in Egypt is estimated by Appian at not less than nine months^h: and that this computation bears date from the time of his arrival, appears from the context of Appian; and also from the fact that Cleopatra, with whom he became acquainted soon after his arrival, was delivered of a son by him soon after his departureⁱ. Though he might have arrived therefore, about the middle of August, and reduced Alexandria to submission by the sixth of March; it is nothing incredible that he should still have prolonged his residence in Egypt, for the sake of the society of Cleopatra, to the middle of May.

It is stated in the Paschal chronicle^k, that the *ἀντονομία* of the city of Antioch bore date from the 20th of Artemisius, or iv Idus of May, in consequence of an edict of Julius Cæsar's, which was received and recited on that day, and followed by his proclamation as dictator or emperor, on the 23rd of the same month. Now the years of Antioch bear date from the era of this *ἀντονομία*; the epoch of which is fixed by the concurrent testimony of coins and history, to the autumnal quarter of U. C. 705. But as Cæsar could not possibly issue any such edict in the first year of the era, the spring

* The Maffæan calendar dates the reduction of Alexandria, March 27.

^g Ibid. 5, 6, 7.

^h B. C. ii. 90.

ⁱ Plutarch, Julius Cæsar, 49. Antonius, 54.

^k i. 354. l. 19.

quarter of U. C. 706, it follows that it must have been issued in the next, U. C. 707, or in some later year: and that it was out of compliment to its author merely, that the epoch of the era was made to bear date from the autumnal quarter of U. C. 705, not of U. C. 706. The former was the first year of Cæsar's dictatorship; and from that time to his death, in March, U. C. 710, he was reckoned at Antioch to have reigned four years and seven months; a computation, which dated from September, U. C. 705, would be substantially correct. The receipt of this edict at Antioch, May 12, U. C. 707, would be demonstrative proof that Cæsar was still in Egypt, at the beginning of that month *.

We know no more of the movements of Cæsar after this, than that he was actually at Antioch¹ on or about July 18, U. C. 707, and at Ziela, in Cappadocia, on the second of August, when he defeated Pharnaces. His freedman, Philotimus, dispatched to Italy while he was still in Egypt, came to Rhodes on his way, v Kal. Junias^m; which implies that he had left Egypt

* Was iv Ides of May U. C. 707, the date of this rescript of Cæsar's; that is, May 12 in the year of Numa? and was Artemisius 20 the day of the month coinciding with it in the year of Antioch? But when did Artemisius in the year of Antioch at this time begin? Subsequently, and after the Julian calendar had been adopted in Asia, Artemisius, in the year of Pergamus, is known to have begun March 25: and its 20 would coincide with April 13, which in the year of Numa would be just 28 days before May 12. This would imply that

the difference between a certain date in the rectified year, and a corresponding one in that of Numa, U. C. 707, was but 28 days; which is so improbable, as almost necessarily to require us to suppose that May 12 was not the date of Cæsar's rescript merely, but the actual date in the Roman rectified year corresponding to the same in the year of Antioch as adapted to it. In this case, Artemisius 1 coincided with April 23; as it might do, if it was the *eighth* month in the civil year of Antioch, though the *seventh* in that of Pergamus.

¹ Cicero, ad Atticum, xi. 20.
xi. 23.

^m Cicero, Oratio pro Ligario, 3. Ad Atticum,

three or four days before : all which is inconsistent with the hypothesis that Cæsar did not leave Egypt before the end of May.

There is no alternative in short, except to suppose either that the ancient calendars referred to formerly, have misrepresented the date of the battle, or that the date which they exhibit is the rectified date ; as September 22 or 23 may be the nominal. That great uncertainty hung over the date of this celebrated battle, within an hundred years after the event, is indeed implied by Lucan :

Cedant feralia nomina Cannæ,
Et damnata diu Romanis Allia fastis.
Tempora signavit leviorum Roma malorum:
Hunc voluit nescire diem.

vii. 408.

We find Velleius Paterculus complaining of a similar uncertainty, within less than that time, about the age of Pompey himself at the period of his death ⁿ, of which Plutarch, *in Vita*, furnishes an instance^o. It would be absurd, however, to suppose the true date was never known ; and little less so to assume that it might have been forgotten too early to be noted in the *Kalendaria* in question ; which appear to have been contemporary, and to belong in common to the reign of *Augustus* or *Tiberius*, especially the *Antiatine* and the *Amiternine*.

The confusion of the times, from the breaking out of the civil war to the year of the rectification of the calendar, may, perhaps, render it doubtful, whether the usual intercalation would be observed in U. C. 706. But Cæsar himself was the pontifex maximus at that

ⁿ Lib. ii. 53. ^o Capp. 6. 7. Pompey is said to be 23. U. C. 671, Consul Scipione, which is correct. Hence he would be 24. U. C. 672. (12.) yet, 46, it is said he was 40 only at his Triumph ; when he was in reality 45 : for U. C. 693 — 648 = 45 : cap. 64. Plutarch makes him 58. U. C. 706, which is correct, yet (79) fifty-nine complete at his death, the same year.

time *; and it was the duty of the pontifical college in particular to see that the intercalations were duly made. There is authority enough to prove that U. C. 702, U. C. 704, and U. C. 708, were regular intercalary years: on which principle, U. C. 706 would be, or should have been, so too.

First—it appears from Asconii Præfatio in Orationem pro Milone, that U. C. 702, when Pompey was consul iii. *sine collega*, was intercalated. Pompey himself was appointed consul v Kal. Martias, *mense intercalario*: and the Oratio pro Milone was delivered vi Ides of April afterwards †.

For the next year, Cicero writes to Atticus, from his province, *Ut simus annui, ne intercaletur quidem* ^p: again, in a letter written on the Ides of February, U. C. 704: *Cum scies Romæ intercalatum sit necne* ^q. So likewise: *Ea sic observabo, quasi intercalatum non sit* ^r. And that there was the usual intercalation, U. C. 704, whether Cicero wished it or not, appears from Dio ^s. Curio, says Dio, to serve a party purpose in behalf of Cæsar, proposed another intercalary month to be inserted that year: ἡξίου μῆνα ἄλλον . . . ἐπεμβληθῆναι. There had been one, then, inserted previously.

* He became Pontifex Maximus on the death of Metellus Pius, U. C. 691. Dio, xxxvii. 37. Cf. Suetonius, Julius, 13.

† If there were any doubt about the fact of this intercalation, U. C. 702, it would be removed by the help of Cicero's ludicrous date, *ad Att. v. 13. Ephesum venimus ad diem xi Kal. Sextiles* (U. C. 703) *sexagesimo et quingentesimo post pugnam Bovillam*. He refers to the death of Clodius, xiii Kal.

Feb. U. C. 702. This number cannot be made out even in round numbers, (old style,) except by supposing an intercalation, U. C. 702. Cf. vi. 1. Also he reckons it, *pro Milone* 35, the hundredth day on the vi Ides of April, in the same year, when the oration was pronounced, from the death of Clodius, xiii. Kal. Feb. Neither can this be made out even in round numbers without an intercalation.

As to the year U. C. 708, it was intercalated, according to Suetonius, *ex consuetudine* *.

The irregularity of the intercalations^t, generally speaking, of which Suetonius complains *loc. cit.* renders it superfluous to go much further back, in tracing out the series of such years, for any length of time. The first instance of intercalation upon record, according to Varro, as quoted by Macrobius, was Coss. Pinario et Furio, U. C. 282: according to Fulvius, also quoted, was much later, U. C. 562, or 563. The *Fasti triumphales* and *consulares* notice some such years. B. C. 189 was an intercalated year. Lucius Scipio Asiaticus triumphed that year, *Mense intercalario, pridie Kalendas Martias*^u. B. C. 167 was intercalated *Postridie Terminalia*^x: and B. C. 170 was the same, *Tertio die post Terminalia*^y.

In these last instances, there were three years between two successive intercalations; which does not of itself imply any irregularity. The year of Numa^z consisting of 355 days, not of 354, was ten days and six hours, not eleven days and six hours, less than a Julian one of 365 days and six hours. But the rule, originally, was to intercalate first 22 days, and then 23, alternately, every *two* years, the place of the intercalation being after Feb. 23: *Terminalibus jam peractis*. Four such intercalations in eight years would amount to ninety days; but the corresponding excess of eight Julian over eight of Numa's years would amount only to eighty-two: a difference which in 24 years, or three periods of eight years, would be equal to 24 days.

* The intercalation *extraordinary* in this year, or that in consequence of the rectification of the calendar, an intercalation made at twice, is alluded to by Cicero, *Ad Fam. vi. 14*: *Ego idem tamen, cum a. d. v Kalendas intercalares priores, &c.*

^t Cf. Solini *Polyhistor*, i. §. 43. Ammianus Marcellinus, xxvi. i. 447. Servius, *Ad Æneid. v. 49*. Macrobius, i. 14. ^u Livy, xxxvii. 59. ^x xlv. 44. ^y xliii. 11. Macrobius, i. 13.

To restore, therefore, the equality of the year of Numa to the Julian or Solar, *tertio quoque octennio*, says Macrobius, *ita intercalandos dispensabant dies, ut non nonaginta, sed (90-24) sexaginta sex intercalarent*^a. I understand this to mean that for the last eight years of every 24, they introduced three intercalary months of 22 days; two at the end of three years, and one at the end of two*. On this principle, between two successive intercalations, (as for instance, B. C. 170 and B. C. 167.) there might be periodically, that is, every 24 years, three years', and not two years' interval. This could not, however, have been the case, at the period of the battle of Pharsalia; because U. C. 704, before it, and U. C. 708, after it, were, as we have seen, intercalated years.

A still more recent example of an intercalary year was U. C. 671, two years before U. C. 673, when Cicero's Oration pro P. Quintio was pronounced^b. On this principle, U. C. 703, just 32 years afterwards, it might be said, would be intercalary. But two intercalations only might take place in six years. U. C. 671

* And this was more agreeable to the usage of the Greeks, who intercalated thrice in the octaeteric cycle; in the third, the fifth, and the eighth years, respectively: τοὺς ἐμβολίμους μῆνας ἔταξαν ἀγεσθαι ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ ἔτει, καὶ πέμπτῳ, καὶ ὀγδόῳ δύο μὲν μῆνας, μεταξὺ δύο ἐτῶν πιπτόντων, that is, two complete years; viz. between the eighth and third, and the fifth and eighth: ἓνα δὲ, μεταξὺ ἐνὸς ἐνιαυτοῦ ἀγομένον, viz. that between the third and fifth. Geminus, cap. vi. Uranologion, 35. C. D. Epiphanius' account of the octaeteric cycle, in his time,

differs from this; for he speaks of ninety days as being to be distributed over the cycle, in three intercalary months of full thirty days each; κατὰ τρία ἔτη μὴν εἷς, καὶ κατὰ δύο τὰ ὑστερα ἔτη μὴν εἷς: that is, every three years one month, which means two months in the first six years, and every two last years of the cycle one month: Operum i. 825. C. Audiani xiii. On this principle, the intercalated years were the third, the sixth, and the eighth; which Geminus supposed to be the third, the fifth, and the eighth.

^a Cf. Livy, i. 19.

^b Capp. 6. 8. 12. 18. 25. Anlus Gellius, xv. 28.

might be one of those ; and U. C. 674 the next : and U. C. 676 might be the end of that cycle of 24 years. Hence U. C. 676 + 24 or U. C. 700, would be the end of the next : and U. C. 702, U. C. 704, U. C. 706, U. C. 708, would be the first eight years of the next cycle, and all intercalary of course.

The implicit testimony of Cicero respecting the date of the vernal equinox, U. C. 705, before the correction of the calendar, derives some confirmation from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, where he speaks of certain ceremonies as performed on the Ides or at the middle of May, ὅσον τι μικρόν after the vernal equinox^c. Dionysius, it is true, was writing his history between U. C. 725 and U. C. 747, and therefore after the correction of the calendar in U. C. 708, when the vernal equinox had been fixed to March 25. But he can scarcely mean here the vernal equinox, as it had been recently fixed ; he must mean it as it had been before : for he would not have called the Ides of May ὅσον τι μικρόν after March 25.*

But the most decisive criterion of the difference between the civil year and the solar, at particular periods before the redressing of the calendar, is supplied by the dates of eclipses, which are mentioned in the Roman historians, and specified according to the old style. Thus, there was a solar eclipse, B. C. 190, v Ides of Quintilis^e. This must be the eclipse, mentioned in Pingrè for that year, on March 14, and vi-

* It may be supposed, too, from what is mentioned in Livy^d, relating to the Ver Sacrum, that the time of the vernal equinox, U. C. 560, was somewhere about Pridie Kalendas Maias, if not that day itself. This would shew

a continued rate of progression for 520 years, which in the course of 148 more, might bring it to the middle of May. For the explanation of the phrase, Ver Sacrum, see Dionysius Hal. Ant. Rom. i. 16.

^c Ant. Rom. i. 38. p. 97. l. 1.

^d xxxiv. 44.

^e Livy xxxvii. 4.

sible all over Europe. Between March 14 and v Ides of Quintilis (July 11) in the year of Numa, the difference would be 115 days in all^f.

There was an eclipse of the moon, the night before Pridie Nonas Septembres*, Sept. 3^o. old style, B. C. 168, the night before the battle of Pydna; which

* This date has been objected to, because Livy, xlv. 19, mentions the Ides of March, when the consul Æmilius Paulus entered upon his year of office at Rome; and Ib. 22. the last day of the same month, when the *Feriæ Latinæ* were celebrated by him at Rome, immediately before his departure to Macedonia. It appears also from xlv. 41, that after his arrival to assume the command of the army, the war was decided in fifteen days' time. Between March 31 and Sept. 3, in the year of Numa, the interval would much exceed that.

As to this difficulty, I will simply observe that the consistency of Livy with himself, in his date of the eclipse, is confirmed by the further date of the day when the news of the battle of Pydna was brought to Rome; Ante diem decimum Kalendas Octobres; lib. xlv. 1: on the thirteenth day after it was fought, or thereabouts. Nor does it appear to me that there is any absolute necessity of restricting the entire duration of the war, dated from the Ides of March in the year in question, to the incredibly short space of time, which Æmilius alludes to in his speech; (and in the assertion of which, Livy is corro-

borated by many other authorities;) but only to the interval between his actual arrival in Macedonia, in the presence of the enemy, and the decision of the contest by the victory of Pydna. Nor is it certain that Livy in speaking of the Ides, and of the last day of March, previously, speaks there according to the old style, rather than to the new. In fact, the supposition of only fifteen days' interval, or not much more, between the time of Æmilius' leaving Brundisium, and the date of the battle, is inconsistent with either mode of reckoning alike, especially with that which supposes the time of his departure about April 1. in the civil year; if the night before the battle was signalized by a lunar eclipse, which fell out on June 21, in the solar, or Sept. 3, in the civil year. On this principle, too, Æmilius must have set sail not long before the beginning of June in the solar year; whatever might be the date answering to that, at the time, in the civil year. And who will consider it probable that an experienced commander like him, going out upon an expedition of so much danger and uncertainty as this, would not think of taking the field before the beginning of June?

^f Macrobius, i. 13. ^g Cicero, De Repub. i. circa principium. Livy, xlv. 37. Valerius Maximus, viii. xi. 1. Pliny, H. N. ii. 9. Justin, xxxiii. 1. Zonaras, ix. 23. 458. A. Cf. 24. 459. D. Polybius, xxix. 6. and Suidas, in Πολλὰ κενὰ τοῦ πολέμου.

Pingrè exhibits on the 21st of June. The difference between June 21, and September 3 in the year of Numa, would be seventy-one days in all. But if B. C. 170 and B. C. 167 were intercalated, as we have seen, we may presume that neither B. C. 169 nor B. C. 168 was so. In this case, and making allowance for the excess produced by the mere absence of the usual intercalation, the true difference between the civil and the solar year would be only 71–26 days at most, Sept. 3, B. C. 168: or not more than forty-five days; which is the exact amount of the difference between the solar and lunar year, U. C. 708. B. C. 45.

A solar eclipse is also specified B. C. 188, for which Pingrè has none except on July 17, whereas this appears to be mentioned soon after the Ides of March^b.

In Cæsar, *De Bello Africano*, a remarkable storm is specified as occurring at the time of the setting of the Pleiads, *Virgiliarum signo confecto*ⁱ, which setting took place, for the meridian of Utica, where Cæsar was, somewhere about vi Kal. Feb. U. C. 708, according to the old style. The day, it is true, is not precisely stated; and, therefore, no decisive argument can be founded on the coincidence. In the rectified year, the date of the *Virgiliarum occasus* was iii Idus Novembres: and modern astronomical calculations have shewn that this setting happened, for the meridian in question, U. C. 707, November 10 or 11. From this latter date, to vi Kal. Feb. old style, the interval would be 72 days, or 27 more than 45, our supposed excess, U. C. 708. But of these 27, twenty-two or twenty-three would be accounted for by the lapse of two years complete, since the last intercalation U. C. 706. And as the writer is not exact that the storm in question happened critically on vi Kal. Feb. but merely about

^b Livy, xxxviii. 36. 35.

ⁱ 47. 37.

that period, it might have happened two or three days earlier, which would explain the remaining difference.

That two years had certainly elapsed since the nominal January, U. C. 706, is unquestionable. The rest of that year, after the battle of Pharsalia, and all U. C. 707, until the very end of the year, were spent by Cæsar in the east. His victory over Juba, which the calendars place on April 6 or 8^k, was evidently gained on or about the Nones of April, (old style,) April 5 in this year¹; and he himself having set out from Utica on the Ides of June, (old style,) June 13, arrived at Rome, 28 days after; having left Caralis in Sardinia iii Kal. Quintiles^m.

The date of the battle of Munda, as exhibited by two ancient calendars, (the Maffæan and Amiternine,) is remarkable for an anomaly just the reverse of that of the battle of Pharsalia. The author of the work *De Bello Hispanico*, after mentioning xi Kal. March, and ad d. iii Non. Martias, says at lastⁿ, that the victory was won ipsis Liberalibus; with regard to which fact he is supported by Plutarch^o: to whom we may add Dio, who tells us the news of the victory was received at Rome, the day before the Palilia, April 20^p. As the date of the Liberalia was xvi Kal. Apriles, March 17, there was nothing impossible in this; for examples in abundance have been produced elsewhere, to shew that a month might elapse before tidings could reach Rome from Spain. Cæsar himself was twenty-seven days the same year in travelling from Rome to Obulco, not far from the scene of the action in that country^q; though no general of antiquity travelled with such expedition.

^k Cf. Ovid, *Fasti*, iv. 377. 380.
xlili. 14. ^m 98. ⁿ 19. 27. 31.
^q Strabo, iii. 4. 429, 430.

¹ *De Bello Africano*, 79. 75. 82. Cf. Dio,
^o Julius Cæsar, 56. ^p Dio, xlili. 42.

Now the calendars place the battle on the 20th of July, 123 days later than March 17, both being referred to the year of Numa. As the victory was won U. C. 709, after the reformation of the calendar, the date of the author *De Bello Hispanico* may be the true date in the Julian year. That of the calendars could not be the date even in the year of Numa; nor can we explain it except by supposing an error in the 20th of July, for some other number and month; or that this date is intended not of the precise day of the battle of Munda, but of the absolute termination of the contest in Spain. Nicolaus of Damascus, in his life of Augustus^r, tells us that Cæsar was seven months employed against Cnæus Pompeius in Spain: and as he seems to have set out at the end of December, U. C. 708, or the beginning of January, U. C. 709, seven months from that time would actually terminate in July. Cicero, *Ad Atticum*, xiii. 20, shews that Cæsar was at Hispalis, April 30: and *ibid.* 21, that he was not expected to leave Spain, or to return to Rome, before August 1*.

* Four of the ancient calendars, the Maffæan, Copranican, Amiternine, and Antiatine, concur in dating the reduction of Spain on August 2, which may be the day on which Cæsar left

it; though it may also denote the date of the reduction of Spain, U. C. 705, when Cæsar was contending there against Afranius and Petreius.

^r Cap. x.

END OF VOL. III.

5530

Author Greswell, Edward

Bib. Lit

G

Title Dissertations upon the principles and arrangement of
an harmony of the Gospels. Vol. 3.

**University of Toronto
Library**

**DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET**

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

